

JPRS 77660

24 March 1981

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1111



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets () are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

24 March 1981

USSR REPORT

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1111

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Formation of Vanguard Parties in Third World Discussed (Yuriy Nikolayevich Gavrilov; NARODNY AZII I AFRIKI, No 6, 1980)..	1
Social Development Problems of Liberated Countries Addressed (Vladimir Andreyevich Yashkin; NARODNY AZII I AFRIKI, No 6, 1980)..	9
Petrovskiy on Need To Continue Detente (Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No. 1, 1981	21
U.S. Support for Latin American Dictators Attacked (Vladislav Chirkov; NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW, 8 Jan 81)	42
West's Propaganda Efforts Against USSR Condemned (V. N. Ivanov; NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW, 8 Jan 81)	45
U.S. Backing for 'Reactionary' Central American Regimes Attacked (A. Koles; NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW, 27 Jan 81)	48
Uzbekistan's Contacts With Foreign Countries Described (Sur'at Mqasinav; OZBEKISTAN MADANIYATI, 3 Feb 81)	51

REGIONAL

History, Prospects of Georgian National Question Discussed (KOMUNISTI, 23 Dec 80)	54
'L'vov System' Discussed at Oblast's Party Conference (V. Martynov, Ye. Yampol's'kiy; 'RADIANS'KA UKRAYINA', 24 Dec 80)..	63
Increased Freedoms for Soviet Moslems (DER SPIEGEL, 9 Feb 81)	68

INTERNATIONAL

FORMATION OF VANGUARD PARTIES IN THIRD WORLD DISCUSSED

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 6, 1980, signed to press 11 Nov 80 pp 10-23

[Excerpts from article by Yuriy Nikolayevich Gavrilov, doctor of history, professor of the Academy of Social Sciences, member of the editorial board of the journal "Narody Azii i Afriki", specialist in the problems of modern national liberation movement: "Problems of the Formation of Vanguard Parties in Countries of Socialist Orientation"]

[Excerpts] As was mentioned in L. I. Brezhnev's report at the 25th CPSU Congress, in recent years "new progressive shifts have occurred in the economy and political life of Arabian, African, and Asiatic countries of socialist orientation"¹. Problems of political, ideological, and organizational leadership and the problems of the creation and strengthening of vanguard parties are becoming increasingly important for ensuring further successful progress of these countries along the path of socialist orientation.

The party, as a leading and directing force of revolutionary reorganizations which is aware of the laws of social development and sees the ways of their realization, is necessary for accomplishing any true people's revolution (directly socialistic, or consecutively anti-imperialistic, anti-exploiter), when the main task is the solving of positive problems. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, V. I. Lenin said that the readiness of revolutionaries to carry out reorganizations and the readiness of the masses for them do not always coincide.

The essence of political leadership consists, on the one hand, in expressing long-range and vital interests of the social stratum (class) which became a carrier of the leading tendency of social development, and, on the other, without overlooking the final goal of the movement, in undertaking such concrete actions which would not only be understandable to the masses, but would also bring the final goal closer.

At the end of the nineteen sixties and the beginning of the seventies, new important shifts occurred in the struggle for strengthening national sovereignty in the development of a number of countries with progressive revolutionary-democratic systems as a result of the intensification of the process of political and class

1. "Materialy XXV s'yezda KPSS" [Materials of the 25th CPSU Congress], Moscow 1976, p 12.

differentiation. In the social sphere, this became evident because part of the revolutionary democracy started expressing the interests of not simply nonproletarian strata of the workers and peasantry as a whole, but more and more definitely interests of the working, chiefly the poorest, peasantry and the emerging proletariat. In the sphere of ideology, this was expressed in the announcement of the desire to be guided by the scientific ideology of the revolutionary proletariat. The ruling revolutionary democracy of some countries, including the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Socialist Ethiopia, the People's Republic of Angola, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the People's Republic of Congo, and the People's Republic of Benin, declared scientific socialism as their official ideology. At the same time, conditions are being created consistently in the above-mentioned countries for equipping regular workers of all levels with the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist knowledge and for involving broader masses of workers in active participation in social life and political struggle.

These shifts reflect the arrival of a qualitatively new stage in the development of revolutionary democracy. The key to the understanding of its positions is Lenin's theses that "one cannot be a revolutionary democrat if he is afraid to move to socialism", and that only that is a revolutionary democrat who "actually 'considers' the interest of the majority of the people" and is capable of determining the aggregate of practical measures which, expressing the interest of the working majority, would open up the prospects of widening and deepening of the revolutionary process and would create a basis for the protection of revolutionary reorganizations¹.

As the anti-imperialistic struggle progresses, the social composition of revolutionary democracy changes and continues to change; it becomes a representative of other social strata than before. The first generation of eastern revolutionary democracy which emerged to the foreground of the political struggle during the epoch of the awakening of Asia expressed the interests of all nontraditional social strata, and the ideas of subjective socialism by which it was guided were directed objectively toward the destruction of the patriarchal system, clearing the path toward capitalism. At the end of the nineteen fifties and the beginning of the sixties, the second generation of revolutionary democracy came into being. It reflected the positions of working peasants and lower strata of urban population. This generation proceeds from the decisive role of working masses in history and considers itself a defender of their interests. Of course, there exist time limits within which one or another generation of revolutionary democracy prevails, these stages of its development are stages of social and ideological evolution rather than temporal stages. For the new tasks -- total eradication of exploitation and inequality in society -- it was necessary to have not only an ideology expressing the interests of the working masses, but also organizational forms making it possible to ensure definite relations among the leaders, the ruling organization, the most socially and politically active social stratum and the masses, i.e., the whole aggregate of the workers and the exploited people. The new social, ideological and political platform of revolutionary democracy brought the tasks of socialistic orientation and socialistic revolution closer together. Changes in the tasks of the forthcoming stage of revolutionary reorganizations and the intensification of the process of social and political differentiation have put in the forefront the necessity of searching for concrete

1. V.I. Lenin. Complete Works, Vol 34, pp 188, 190.

ways of bringing eventually chiefly nonproletarian working masses to socialism. This is achieved by a long-term educational and organizational work, systematic implementation of economic, social, and cultural reforms, and isolation of the main problems whose solution educates the masses politically, unites the working people, and contributes to the acceleration of social, economic, and cultural progress.

The new tasks of the revolution required also definite, including structural, changes in the main instrument of the revolution -- the leading party. Specifically, the increased tasks of the economic, national, and cultural construction and the ideological and political education of the masses made it necessary to change the party organizations and all party members into staunch, active, and mature fighters for the socialist future, i.e., to transform the leading party from a more or less amorphous association of the entire or almost the entire people realizing to some degree the incompatibility of their interests with the interests of foreign oppressors into a disciplined and purposeful instrument of social reorganization.

There are several very complicated problems standing in the way of qualitative changes in the development of revolutionary democratic organizations whose solution depends on the whole complex of objective and subjective factors. During the period of the selection of socialist orientation, revolutionary democracy expressed the interest of the peasantry as a whole, the strata of nonproletarian urban workers, as well as of the interest of the forming proletariat, since they were not separated from the interest of the workers in general. It was natural that not all representatives of revolutionary democracy were able to switch from the positions common for all nonproletarian workers to the positions of the working peasantry and proletariat. Further, one should not disregard the force of traditions which cannot be easily overcome even if the leaders are pursuing a correct policy. In most countries, independence and embarkation on the path of socialist orientation were achieved under the guidance of an organization which in our literature is justly called "front-type organization". It is not a party in the strict sense of the word, since in most cases such organizations united heterogeneous social forces for achieving political sovereignty.

Revolutionary democrats of the second generation in the overwhelming majority of cases theoretically recognized the necessity of changing the broad-scale organization with whose aid independence was achieved into an effective instrument of ideological education and political guidance. However, in many instances this either remained to be a good intention, or the reorganization was not fully completed, or a party which was not a vanguard party but united the entire or almost the entire population was proclaimed to be a vanguard party. The last variant was even substantiated "theoretically".

The problem of the necessity of changing a broad-scale organization into a vanguard organization was particularly critical after revolutionary democrats, first in 1966 in Ghana and then in 1967 in Mali, were removed from power. Leaders of other countries of socialist orientation did not draw synonymous conclusions from the fact that the National Convention of Ghana which had 2.2 million people in its ranks was easily deprived of power. Almost all of them greatly exaggerated the specificity of the situation in their countries and the significance of the socioeconomic reforms which had already been implemented. For example, I. Diarra, political secretary of Mali's ruling party Sudan League, wrote: "Under the conditions when the objective base of

the struggle for socialism is growing qualitatively and quantitatively and, simultaneously, the base of opposition is narrowing, it would be paradoxical to want to change the nature of the instrument (i.e., the ruling party -- Yu. G.) which made this evolution possible"¹. The unwillingness to change "the nature of the instrument" was motivated by the fact that a changeover to new principles of party structure would, supposedly, lead only to an increase in the number of opponents of socialist orientation and to "changing hidden processes into an open political struggle, particularly today when it is known that time is on the side of the forces of progress"². Some of the revolutionary democrats still believed in the effect of objective factors which, supposedly, by themselves without any interference of revolutionary leaders would lead to the desired results. The Mali leaders believed that "at a certain stage, the dialectics of the development would lead to qualitative changes within the party"³.

And many years after the counterrevolutionary coup in Mali, some revolutionary democrats, recognizing that when a party changes into a ruling party its responsibility for the fate of its people increases, insist at the same time on the principle of a "broad" organizational structure of the party.

It is very wrong to contrast a class party with a mass party and their class and national-patriotic principles. A vanguard class party absorbs the best that is in a historically rising class and the best representatives of other social forces of society and expresses fundamental and long-range needs of national development. At the same time, only a long experience in a political class struggle and a sufficiently high degree of ideological and political maturity make it possible to draw a clear distinction between patriotism and nationalism.

A vanguard party is only a party which is inseparably linked with the life of those strata of society which are capable of further development of revolution and, through them, with all working and oppressed people. A party becomes a truly vanguard party when it enjoys the full confidence of the strata whose vital interests it expresses and those of all the masses. The appearance of such a party cannot be simply a result, as I. Diarra put it, of the "dialectics of the development" of one or another country. Spontaneity is also caused by the idea that, supposedly, under the conditions of former colonial countries the entire or almost the entire population is capable of conscious participation in the struggle for their vital interests. Without a true vanguard party knowing the goals and methods of struggle, the working people are not capable of a truly powerful revolutionary impact.

Of course, a party which is a leader and organizer of progressive reforms opening up the way to the building of socialism cannot have a small membership, it must be a mass party. But to be a mass party and to unite the entire population is not the same. In his interview with a delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic in 1921, V. I. Lenin stressed that the goal of a people's revolutionary party is "to become a mass party and not to be contaminated by alien elements"⁴.

1. I. Diarra, "A Mass Party and the Building of Socialism", PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA (Problems of Peace and Socialism), 1967, No 1, p 32

2. Ibid

3. Ibid, p 33

4. V.I. Lenin. Complete Works, Vol 42, p 233

Many revolutionary democrats believe that implemented measures are sufficient for entering the stage of direct socialist construction and even declare their states to be socialistic; at the same time they state that the change to socialism is supported by the entire or almost the entire mass of the population -- by all those social forces which participated in the achievement of political sovereignty.

A vanguard party can prepare the masses for the understanding of the necessity of deepening and expanding the reforms only when there is unity with respect to the fundamental and tactical problems within it and when each member of it becomes an active fighter for the building of a new society. At the same time, the demands made of the party cannot be applied to the entire mass, to all social strata on whose behalf the party acts.

Historical experience accumulated to date indicates that the qualitative changes in the parties which directed the emergence of their countries on the road of socialist orientation cannot lead spontaneously, "in a natural way", to that qualitative change as a result of which a vanguard party appears. The "masses" in former colonial and dependent countries are still in such a stage of their sociopolitical maturation that it is difficult for them to understand the existence of a greater community than a narrow village world. When these masses are inevitably drawn into the system of commodity-money relations and their accumulation instinct is awakened, they inevitably lose their radical aspirations, and there is an increasing danger that once revolutionary-democratic mass organizations might regenerate into right-wing reformists. In this situation, the importance of the leading party is particularly great, and the demands made of it are higher.

Life has shown that in countries where proletariat did not yet shape into an independent sociopolitical force, only the third generation of revolutionary democracy was able to realize the inadequacy of the former social orientation and start creating the conditions ensuring the formation of a true vanguard party. One of the characteristic aspects in the formation of the third generation of revolutionary democracy was the intensification of attention to the development of a theory, political education, social education of the masses, and thorough preparation of their activities.

Having set the task of uniting in ruling parties only the supporters of the struggle against exploiters, both foreign and local, and having outlined the socialist orientation more precisely, the revolutionary-democratic leaders became convinced that not all participants of the movement for political sovereignty were ready for the struggle for the new goals.

The entire experience of political struggles in their own countries and in the world as a whole convinced revolutionary democrats that only the working class is a consistently revolutionary class during the transition period from capitalism to socialism at the worldwide scale and that only on the basis of the ideology of the revolutionary working class, scientific socialism, it is possible to achieve extensive reforms in interests of the majority of the working people.

Of course, there is no direct relationship between the social nature and the social composition of one or another party or organization. In the past and in the present, there existed and are existing parties more of whose members are working people, but which do not at all express their vital and long-range interests.

There is also no direct relationship between the stage of social development and the degree of ideological and theoretical maturity of society. Ideology has its own logic and its own laws of development which are not directly connected with the social structure of society and even with the experience of political struggle accumulated by the emerging class or revolutionary forces. Just as some countries can proceed to socialism by-passing capitalism without necessarily passing through all stages of becoming capitalistic formations, the formation of a vanguard party can begin before the changing of the national working class to class for itself. But, just as the transition from precapitalistic relations to socialism requires a relatively long period of time, the transformation of a revolutionary democratic party to a Marxist-Leninist vanguard of workers, a truly leading and directing force of society, is a long and complex process.

The experience of the worldwide revolutionary process indicates that in a number of countries, where social and economic development was deformed and hindered by foreign oppressors, communist parties headed the building of socialism.

The ideology of Marxism-Leninism integrates the struggle of revolutionary forces in each individual country with the worldwide liberation movement without which it is impossible under present conditions to achieve either national (political) or social liberation.

It should be mentioned that in the majority of countries which embarked at the end of the nineteen sixties and the beginning of nineteen seventies on the path of socialist orientation, attempts were made earlier for creating independent proletarian parties. Young Asians and Africans who were educated abroad in the countries of their masters who during the years of their training participated in democratic and social struggle, having returned to their countries, joined the process of creating political organizations heading the struggle for national and social liberation. At first, practically everywhere their activities were an attempt to transfer mechanically the general principles of the revolutionary theory and work experience of communist parties of capitalistic countries to the local soil.

Historical experience has shown that those who advanced the slogan about the creation in the shortest time of national communist parties in the Portuguese, as well as in the French colonies in the Tropical Africa in the sixties, did not take into consideration the entire specificity of the sociopolitical situation in the region. Communist parties in the Tropical Africa could not appear due to the small size of the working class, political unawareness of the people's masses and extreme scarcity of local cadres capable of undertaking the fulfillment of such a task as the creation of a communist party.

Speaking of the prematurity of raising the problem of creating communist parties in the countries of the Tropical Africa, at the same time it is necessary to stress that the activities of Portuguese, French, British, and other communists on political and ideological education of the intelligentsia of colonial countries was of great significance for the liberation movement of the peoples. The political leadership of anticolonial struggle was in the hands of people equipped with a materialistic method of concrete historical analysis, which made it possible for them to determine the sequence of the tasks of the anticolonial struggle and the real possibilities of its growing into a struggle against all types and forms of oppression.

It is in the attitude toward the necessity of creating a party equipped with advanced ideology and mobilizing workers for a struggle for eliminating exploitation and socioeconomic and cultural development of a country that the main division occurs between the second and the third generations of revolutionary democracy.

The mastering of the Marxist-Leninist theory even by the leading nucleus of a revolutionary movement is a long process. To enroot for the scientific socialist ideology on an undeveloped socioeconomic soil is a process even more lengthy and complicated. One of the differences of the third generation of revolutionary democracy from their predecessors is in the fact that the former realize that it is impossible to "introduce" the scientific socialistic ideology and realize that the transition of the whole social strata to new theoretical ideological positions requires a long time.

Under the conditions of the initial stage of the formation of the proletariat, when in its mass (if in general there is a basis to speak about a proletarian mass) it did not yet break the umbilical cord connecting it with the peasantry -- socially limited, captivated by superstitions, tribal and other ethnic prejudices, and choked by an unbearable struggle for physical existence -- the selection in favor of socialism can be brought into the sphere of practical actions only by the leading party.

Angolan, Ethiopian, Yemeni, Mozambican, Congolese, and Benin revolutionaries have already progressed to the creation of a truly vanguard party. They have adopted program documents. However, the adoption of a program is not everything. According to V. I. Lenin, a party becomes such only when it has its program, works out an effective tactical line based on the evaluation of the existing political situation, gives exact answers to the "damned questions" of the present time, takes a position based on principle in relation to other ideological and political trends¹ and leads masses of working people. The acceptance of a program announcing the building of socialism as its goal and having the tasks of establishing economic, social and cultural foundations for preparing objective and subjective conditions for future transition to the building of socialism is a fundamentally important step in the development of countries of socialist orientation and the parties ruling in them. The ideological and theoretical foundations of truly vanguard parties have been laid. It is just as important to develop the charters of these parties since they map out the organizational framework of the everyday and constant control over the implementation of their programs. The adopted programs and the regulations create the bases for parties forming in Southern Yemen, Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Congo, Benin, and other countries to become truly vanguard parties.

At the present time, two interconnected problems are regarded as of paramount importance: party construction and creation of powerful mass organizations. Leaders of the countries of socialist orientation realize what serious difficulties are connected with the shortage of devoted and well prepared personnel and with political inertness of the masses. The problem of education of activists and party members, education of the working people and the entire population is becoming increasingly important. It is also important to educate the working class itself, since not all of them understand the significance of the responsibility imposed on it by history.

The process of the formation of vanguard Marxist-Leninist parties in the countries of Asia and Africa progresses under the conditions when scientific socialism combines

1. V. I. Lenin. Complete Works, Vol 20, p 357.

not with a mature workers' movement, but when, according to the definition of a prominent African revolutionary Amilkar Kabral, the "subordinating role" is played to a greater degree by the intelligentsia which "will bring into the working class the consciousness of its historical mission and the necessity of a broad union with the peasantry, semiproletariat masses, and patriotic petty bourgeoisie"¹.

Leaders of the third generation of revolutionary democracy justly see the main characteristic of their ideological, political, and organizational experience in the fact that they headed the development of revolutionary organizations of liberation movement whose ideological platform was, in the sense of the ideological, political and social views, a mixture of traditional and petty-bourgeoisie ideas both of the right and the left trends, into a vanguard party of workers based on the theory of scientific socialism.

The experience of the development of revolutionary democracy has confirmed the universality of the basic theoretical propositions of Marxism-Leninism. The ties among all units of the anti-imperialistic struggle are becoming stronger and stronger, which makes it possible to fight more successfully against the imperialistic schemes in relation to countries entering the path of fundamental progressive changes and with the sabotage of reactionary elements. This makes up considerably for the lack of development of the objective and subjective factors of revolutionary transformations.

Communists do not only have the priority in clarifying the historical role and possibilities of revolutionary democracy. The Soviet Union and the CPSU are following Lenin's policy of union and support in regard to the anti-imperialistic and revolutionary East and are rendering "support not only moral and political, but also economical and organizational, including help in strengthening their defense" to liberated countries which rejected the capitalist way of development and have a socialist orientation, as stated by L. I. Brezhnev².

Of course, it is not easy to circumvent capitalism. There are both achievements and losses along this path. But the main thing is that the internal logic of the development of anti-imperialistic liberation revolutions in the countries of Asia and Africa has led to the appearance of a wing in the revolutionary democracy which recognizes that it is possible to overcome the hostile activities of external and local exploiting forces only in the presence of a disciplined and influential political party equipped with the ideology of scientific socialism acting in the vanguard of masses which are participating more and more conscientiously and effectively in the struggle for protecting revolutionary achievements and expanding social changes. The leadership of revolutionary democratic parties standing on the Marxist-Leninist positions is now giving great attention to party construction and ideological and political education of the members of the parties being created, which opens up a path for changing these parties into expressers of vital interests and leaders of the working people.

1. A. Kabral, "Revolutsiya v Gvineya" [Revolution in Guinea], (Selected articles and speeches), Moscow, 1973, p 46

2. L. I. Brezhnev. "Following Lenin's Policy", Vol 6, Moscow, 1978, p 591

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki", 1980

10,233

CSO: 1807

INTERNATIONAL

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS OF LIBERATED COUNTRIES ADDRESSED

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 6, 1980, signed to press 11 Nov 80
pp 103-113

[Article by Vladimir Andreyevich Yashkin, Candidate of economics, scientist of the USSR Academy of Sciences of Oriental Studies, specialist in theoretical problems of the present stage of national liberation revolutions: "Liberated Countries in the System of World Social Relations"]

[Text] As a result of the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism in the world, there arose a new economic and political community -- liberated countries. The characteristics of the economic and political content of this community were, as is known, given in the CPSU Program: "Young sovereign states, as is known, do not fit either in the system of imperialistic states or in the system of socialist states. However, the overwhelming majority of them did not break out of the world capitalistic economy, although they occupy a special place there. It is still a part of the world which is being exploited by capitalistic monopolies"¹.

Since that time, of course, there occurred definite changes in the economic and political situation of the liberated countries connected with further weakening of the positions of imperialism and a noticeable increase in the roles of these countries in the world economy and politics. At the same time, under the influence of internal and external factors, the process of their differentiation has increased, not only with respect to the level and structure of their economy or the place which they occupy in the world economy, but also with respect to the orientation of social development. It is stated in the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress: "In many liberated countries, a complex process of the delimitation of class forces is taking place, and class struggle is increasing. This is shown in different ways. New progressive shifts have occurred in the economy and political lives of Arabic, African, and Asiatic countries of socialist orientation. There are also countries where their development progressed further along the capitalist path"².

These changes, undoubtedly, have to be studied very carefully. But the process of the differentiation of the liberated countries has not gone far enough that they cannot be considered as a more or less single and a relatively stable community, especially because in the liberated countries and on the international arena there are factors which not only facilitate, but also hinder the decomposition of this community³.

1. Materials of the CPSU 22nd Congress, Moscow, 1961, p 352.

2. Materials of the CPSU 25th Congress, Moscow 1976 p 12.

3. See Ye. M. Prinaikov. "Liberated Countries: Social Problems", NARODY AZII I AFRIKI [Peoples of Asia and Africa], 1980, No 5.

The idea of liberated countries as being a relatively single, although a very contradictory unit with all multiformity of their internal and external ties is, in our opinion, a necessary condition of the objective analysis of the problems of their social development, and only on this basis it is possible to determine the essence of their social relations, to reveal their place in the system of world social relations and tendencies of their development, and finally, to classify them with respect to the basic economic, social, political characteristics.

Soviet investigators have done much in respect to the accumulation and understanding of the empirical materials about liberated countries and developing a scientifically substantiated concept of their social development. They have formulated the main characteristics of these countries as a social system⁴, and made a significant progress in the developing of their scientific classification⁵. However, we can hardly say now that all theoretical problems in the study of such a varied and complex phenomenon as liberated countries have been solved. In our opinion, the most interesting problems are those of the essence of the transitional period in these countries, the content and tendencies of their formational development, general and specific features of this development, and the peculiarities of the process of class formation which is being discussed in the exchanges of opinions on the pages of the magazine "Peoples of Asia and Africa".

The transitional nature of the present stage of social development of liberated countries is recognized by almost all participants of the discussion. In principle, everyone agrees that, with all its specificity, social development of these countries follows the general laws of world social development and the transitional period in these countries, as a reflection of the general crisis of the capitalist formation, is a part of the worldwide process of transition from capitalism to socialism. However, so far, there is no agreement among scientists regarding the special characteristics of the transitional period in these countries.

In our opinion, the main disagreements result from different evaluations of the level of the social development of liberated countries and their place in the system of the world social relations (before and after the decay of the colonial system of imperialism), as well as from different understanding of the role of certain factors (internal and external, basic and superficial) in their social development.

* * *

4. See, for example: S. I. Tyul'panov, "Ocherki politicheskoy ekonomii" [Essays on Political Economy], Moscow, 1969; A. I. Levkovskiy, "'Tretiy mir' v sovremennoy mire" ['The Third World' in the Modern World], Moscow, 1970; "Razvivayushchiesya strany: zakonomernosti, tendentsii, perspektivy" [Developing Countries: Regularities, Tendencies, and Prospects], Moscow, 1974; ZARUBEZHNIY VOSTOK I SOVREMENNOST', vol 1-2, Moscow, 1974.

5. "Tipologiya nesotsialisticheskikh stran" [Typology of Nonsocialistic Countries], Moscow, 1976.

After the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, there started a new stage in the social development of liberated countries connected with the overcoming of their economic backwardness and dependence. However, the peculiarity of the position of these countries in the system of world social relations is not at all limited to contradictions with imperialism. There is direct connection of their contradictions with contradictions of a higher order -- basic contradictions of the modern epoch. Therefore, the content of the transition in the social development of these countries cannot be reduced to the elimination of economic backwardness or to the changing of a dependent type of development into an independent type. Evidently, it is necessary to have a broader historical aspect of its examination, namely, from the viewpoint of the selection of the path of formational development.

Representing a special economic and political community, developing countries, nevertheless, are not any independent formation, because the old (precapitalistic) production methods exist in them now only in the form of residual procedures, and no new homogeneous and specific system of production relations which could join these countries into a special formation has formed.

Also, there is no reason to view these countries in the form of a certain "intermediate" system which would be on the axis of the world social development between capitalism and socialism, combining the substantial features of both formations. It is possible to speak about the intermediate position of this community in the system of world social and historical coordinates only in the sense of the direction of its formational development which under the present conditions, i.e., under the conditions of the existence of two world systems, actually wavers between capitalism and socialism, reflecting deep processes occurring within liberated countries and the interaction of two formations in the international arena.

Before the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, the problem of the selection of the path of the formational development of backward countries, naturally, did not arise, because, in the framework of such a system the function of the system-forming (formational) order, regardless of the degree of the maturity of capitalism in the colonies, was fulfilled by the capitalism of their parent countries⁶. Under these conditions, the development of the colonies could occur only in one direction, i.e., along the capitalist path. However, with the collapse of the colonial system, the situation changed substantially: in the presence of two formations in the world and two systems of the world economy, the problems of the formational affiliation of society in liberated countries and possible directions of its formational development as a whole or in individual groups of this association, in principle, cannot be solved without consideration of the degree of the maturity of national capitalism and the nature of its ties with the world capitalism.

As is known, by the time of the formation of the colonial system of capitalism, the presently liberated countries were at various stages of precapitalistic development and, speaking of these countries as a whole, it is impossible to say that a certain definite method of production prevailed in them. However, with the formation of the colonial system of capitalism, these countries were forced into the world capitalistic

6. See: K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, Vol 3, pp 74-75; Vol 46, Part 1, p 229.

economy, while they continued to be precapitalistic, and their social development was substantially deformed, because later on the replacement of the old social forms by new forms occurred under the control and in the interest of their parent countries, and the huge removal of their national income limited substantially their internal potentials for development.

The inclusion of these countries in the colonial system, undoubtedly, contributed to the development of capitalistic forms of economy in them. However, capitalism, developing within the framework of colonial relations could never transform these countries, with a few exceptions, into a capitalist formation.

It would seem that after the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, the process of the development of capitalist formations in this country should have sharply accelerated. But this did not happen. In the countries which entered the socialist orientation path, the development of capitalism was blocked in various degrees, and in the countries developing along the capitalist path, the transforming and integrating potentials of capitalism (both local and foreign) became clearly inadequate in order to lead to the formation in most of them of a more or less uniform structure subjected to a single system of economic laws.

At the same time, since the development of capitalism in liberated countries occurred chiefly in the form of a certain aggregate of forms, but not an integral and all-embracing system, the capitalist sector here acquired an exceptionally complex and conflicting structure which included structures different in their origin and maturity each of which functioned as a relatively isolated and stable system with its own reproduction cycle.

It is true, that in this sector there are tendencies toward integration of heterogeneous forms of capitalistic economy, but, due to the presence of counteracting factors, it has not yet led to the elimination of interstructural barriers, which, in turn, limits substantially the system-forming (organizing or reorganizing) potentials of local capitalism, such as its ability to subordinate precapitalistic forms of economy to itself⁷.

By this time, the economic structures of the liberated countries have undergone reorganization in various degrees under the effect of internal and external factors. Along with the countries having only sprouts of capitalism and where commodity-money relations are not sufficiently widespread, there are countries in which capitalism is more developed and includes not only mature forms of industrial capital, but also embryos of national monopolies. But even now, there is a predominance of precapitalistic and lower capitalistic forms of economy in the majority of the liberated countries, while mature forms of industrial capital forming the basis of the capitalistic means of production are either not yet sufficiently widespread, or are represented chiefly by foreign monopolistic capital. In other words, in spite of the changes that have occurred, very significant at times, capitalism has not developed as a formation in the majority of the liberated countries.

7. See G. K. Shirokov, "Interstructural Interaction in the Developing Countries of the East," *NARODY AZII I AFRIKI* [Peoples of Asia and Africa], 1980, No 5.

This is also confirmed statistically, although, it is necessary to make a reservation that no quantitative analysis, even the most thorough, can replace a qualitative analysis, which is sometimes forgotten when the so-called "obvious" statistical facts are used.

In our opinion, these data confirm the fact that developing countries are not similar with respect to their political economic content and the stages of their maturity, and the periphery of the world capitalistic economy includes not only the countries which have become a part of the capitalistic formation (although they occupy a peripheral position in it), but also countries (and they represent the majority) where capitalism has not yet reached the formational stage of maturity.

At first glance this conclusion seems to contradict the fact that political guidance of society in the countries of capitalistic orientation is accomplished by national bourgeoisie, and most of them are so far developing within the framework of the world capitalistic economy. But, theoretically, there is no contradiction here. Firstly, when capitalism is not mature as a means of production and the national bourgeoisie is not mature as a class, the authority of the national bourgeoisie, where it exists, does not adequately reflect the ratio of the forces of social classes of a multistructural society and, as a rule, is not stable. Secondly, when two systems exist in the world, the development of liberated countries within the framework of the world capitalistic economy is not fatally unavoidable, while profound qualitative shifts in the sphere of foreign economy connected with further changes in the ratio of forces between the two systems limits substantially the possibilities of imperialism to influence the direction of their social development. The process of formational development should not be identified with its final result -- the development of formations, and the affiliation with the system of the world capitalistic economy should not be identified with the affiliation with a capitalistic formation, particularly now, when the tendency of the liberated countries to their transition to a noncapitalistic path of development is accompanied by a tendency toward their withdrawal from the world capitalistic economy. However, it would be equally premature to consider that the liberated countries belong to the socialistic (communist) formation only on the basis that they have embarked on the path of socialist orientation or joined the world socialistic economy.

The present transitional period is characterized by the fact that the effect of the law of the nonuniformity of social development under the conditions of the struggle of the two systems led to considerable complications of the system of the world social relations: the appearance, along with formational communities of countries and the accompanying systems of the world economy, of transitional intermediate forms which differ not only in their position in the world economy, but also in the orientation of their social development. It can be expected that these forms will increase in number in the course of the struggle of the two systems, since new countries which are at different points of the world social and historical space are being drawn into the channel of the world social development, and the trajectories of their social development, and, consequently, the forms of their progress toward socialism cannot be the same.

But this suggests that a unidimensional classification of the modern world is totally ungrounded. Only a multidimensional classification can show the place of the developing countries in the world social and historical process and make it possible to

determine the most probable directions, stages, and forms of their social development.

Within such a classification, it is, evidently, possible to treat the developing countries in two ways: firstly, in a broad sense, as a peripheral link of the world economy as a whole (including formation-type multistructural countries); secondly, in a narrow sense, as a nonformational link of the periphery of the world economy. Accordingly, the entire community of the developing countries can be subdivided into two large groups: firstly, a formational group of countries forming peripheral links of two formations; secondly, a nonformational group of countries of various orientations of their social development forming nonformational links of the systems of the world economy.

The content and the transitional nature in these groups of the developing countries are different. In the formation-type group of countries, the transition was within the limits of the same quality, i.e., from a less mature to a more mature phase of formation, while in the nonformation-type group of countries, the process of the development of the quality itself, i.e., of the formation, progresses. Due to this, the formational development in this group of countries has a number of substantial characteristics.

Firstly, while the new formation in these countries has not developed or has not become established, the interaction of their structures, their struggle, and cooperation will be reflected in the economic development of these countries much more than in a multistructural economy of the formation type, i.e., where the predominant structure has already taken shape, but the multistructural characteristic has not yet been eliminated.

Secondly, the role of superstructural factors of social development is considerably greater, because, in the absence of a predominant method of production and incompleteness of the class-formation process, the role of the system-forming (formational) structure proceeds, as a rule, to the state structure, and the degree of the relative independence of the political substructure increases substantially.

Thirdly, the new role of external factors of social development and the influence of the developed formations on a multistructural society is much stronger than in the interaction of countries with developed formations, particularly because a multistructural society is an aggregate of less mature productive forces and production relations.

Although the decisive role in the development of these countries is played by internal factors, i.e., interrelations which form within the limits of a multistructural formation, the role of external factors in the development of these countries increases and shows itself not just more strongly, but qualitatively differently than in multistructural countries of the formation type or even more so in monostructural centers of formations, which is only a different expression of their special position in the world economy and in the entire system of the world social relations. Unlike the developed countries whose national economies develop chiefly as integral and independent self-reproducing systems, the economies of the liberated countries has been developing so far as a peripheral element of the world economy, which makes them dependent on their leading center, although the influence of these centers themselves on the development of the peripheral links is essentially different.

Due to this, it is believed that the possibilities for a multivariant development of the liberated countries are incomparably greater than for societies with developed formations and the orientation of their social development, due to the instability of the economic basis and the political superstructure, can change many times, although the selection of the variants as well as the possibilities of changes in the orientation are limited, of course, by the conditions of the world social and historical process.

There is no doubt that the development of these societies obeys internal laws, but it experiences definite influences of the formations existing in the world, i.e., capitalism and socialism, which, being more advanced and mature forms of social structure, draw them into their orbits and form a distinctive field or band within which the "freedom of creating" new social forms is only possible. Therefore, although the development of the above-mentioned societies can be multivariant, it does not mean at all that it is possible to have any arbitrarily selected variant -- preservation of the present nonformational state of these societies or their transformation into an independent formation⁸.

Any attempts to reveal the regularities and tendencies of the social development of liberated countries only from within (from the viewpoint of their multistructural composition) or only from without (from the viewpoint of their inclusion in the world economy) unavoidably leads to negative results -- to the appearance of a concept of dependent (capitalistic) development within which these countries appear as a pale, delayed, and deformed reflection of the center of the system, or a concept of an "autonomous" multistructure which, supposedly, develops by itself.

In the light of the above, the peculiarity of the liberated countries is not the stability of their social structure (this property explains little by itself and is to some extent characteristic of many social phenomena), but the incompleteness of their formational development and (along with this) their inclusion in the worldwide process of the struggle of two formations. It is this that determines the nature and limits of its stability and instability, while the long preservation of the properties constituting the multistructural development of a society can coexist with frequent changes in the orientation of the development.

Of course, the stability of liberated countries as a special community is maintained not only by the effects of spontaneous forces, internal or external, but also by a completely conscientious desire to preserve their specific features. In economy, this desire is realized in the attempts to ensure a balanced development of structures and to form one's own zone in the world economy, and in politics -- to achieve a harmony of class interests and to get the upper hand in international relations. This desire to take an intermediate position is, in general, characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie⁹, and it takes very tangible forms if the petty bourgeoisie, having mastered the political superstructure, receives a strong economic reinforcement in the form of

8. See: N. A. Chashkov. Transactions of MGIMO MID SSSR [Moscow State Institute of International Relations of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs], PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEZENIYA [Problems of Oriental Studies], No V, Moscow, 1978. See also: NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, 1978, No 2, pp 234-236.

9. See: K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, Vol 8, p 151; Vol 27, p 412.

a state structure. In this case, with a relative balance of the internal and external forces, the decomposition process of the above-mentioned communities can be delayed for a long time. However, in the final analysis, the attempt to wander "between two worlds" or to grope for a "third path" is unavoidably doomed to failure: the internal laws of development, just as the influence of two world systems, destroy the relative stability of a multistructural society and the developing world as a whole.

* * *

While freeing themselves from the chains of colonialism, old or new, the peoples of the developing countries unavoidably encounter the objective necessity and possibility of selecting the path of social development between capitalism and socialism. But the necessity and the possibility of this choice cannot be viewed without the connection with the concrete historical situation in the developing countries and beyond their limits. Although with respect to the precapitalistic methods of production, capitalism is a more advanced system, under the present conditions, i.e., in the presence of the socialistic alternative, the advanced position of capitalism is very relative: the transition to the noncapitalistic path of development and then to socialism immediately takes liberated countries to the main channel of the world social development, rapidly accelerating and shortening the time of social reforms, while the development along the capitalistic path is, in essence, a temporary, although historically conditioned zigzag, which sooner or later must be overcome.

In principle, three ways of the formation of the capitalistic structure in the liberated countries are conceivable. Firstly, the path of "classical" capitalism on the basis of a slow and spontaneous development of precapitalistic forms of economy into capitalistic forms with some, as a rule, insignificant support of the state directing the development of capitalism but not appearing in the role of the owner. This path was possible when capitalism was developing in the line of ascent, although even at that time its formation meant submission and exploitation of precapitalistic societies. However, this is practically impossible in the present situation not only because the struggle of peoples eliminated the very possibility of the colonial form of submission and exploitation, but first of all because there is neither the time nor the mechanism for its realization.

Secondly, there is a modified variant of classical capitalism with active support from outside on the basis of the cooperation of the local and foreign capital taking the role of the main "generator" of capitalistic relations. Attempts are being made to realize this path in many developing countries, and bourgeois propaganda praises this path as supposedly best suited to the conditions and tasks of the development of these countries. This path can actually accelerate the formation of capitalism in liberated countries, particularly if the cooperation of foreign and local capital is accomplished with active support of the state. However, the weakness of this variant is not only in the fact that the inflow of foreign capital does not correspond quantitatively to the actual needs of the developing countries, but also in the very "quality" of the capitalistic relations formed on this basis: in the course of the "fusion" of foreign and local capital on the governmental or private basis, there unavoidably occurs the reproduction of the relations of economic backwardness and subordination. Of course, it would be wrong to underestimate the

possibilities which result from the cooperation of foreign and local capital in individual countries, but on the whole, on the scale of all liberated countries, the hopelessness of this variant of development is evident.

Thirdly, there is a nontraditional path of capitalistic development with active support from above on the basis of a "mixed economy" i.e., when state forms of economy are combined with private forms under the guidance and control of the state. This path is realized in the majority of the developing countries, and it is best suited to the real conditions and tasks of their development. This path facilitates the overcoming of backwardness and subordination, but the main thing is that, as the state structure grows and strengthens, there develops such a social form which, in essence, leads to the undermining of capitalism as a system and the appearance of objective prerequisites for changing to the noncapitalistic path of development.

Of course, in reality, the above variants of the development of capitalism do not exist in isolation, but in a great variety of combinations. But none of these variants, with any combination, leads, as a rule, to the development of the capitalistic formation.

Consequently, it is not a matter of the inability of capitalism to develop in liberated countries in general (this development is in progress, and sometimes it is very rapid), but of its inability or limited ability to take the role of a system-forming (formational) element of a multistructural formation: local capital, as a rule, is too weak to cope with this problem, and the injection of a foreign capital accelerates the development of capitalism only in a backward and dependent form. And the attempts at developing capitalism with the aid of the state, particularly if the development of state forms of economy progresses on a broad scale and in the absence of a wide strata of mature forms of private capital, lead to its rejection.

Although capitalism as a motive power of productive forces has not at all exhausted its potentialities, the historical limits of its development are evident not only in developed countries but also in backward countries, and, probably, are expressed most fully in backward countries. Experience shows that neither foreign nor national capital is capable to ensure a rapid and harmonic development of productive forces of liberated countries and to combine economic development with social progress; the reproduction of foreign capital is limited by the needs of the monopolies of capitalistic countries, and the organizing and reorganizing potential of local capital is too weak due to the heterogeneity of the capitalistic sector, the presence of substantial contradictions among its individual links, as well as the pressure exerted on it by precapitalistic forms of economy from within and by the monopolistic forms of capital from without.

It is no coincidence that the development of mature forms of capitalism and the accompanying industrial system of productive forces in developing countries was and is occurring in a strictly focal form. But even in this form, the production functions of capital obviously exceed its social potentialities, which is expressed, for example, in a more rapid growth of the share of the capitalistic sector in the VVP [internal gross product] than in employment and in progressive lagging of precapitalistic structures with respect to the labor productivity level. Meanwhile, the problem is not in the creation of centers of modern production, but in the reforming or, at

least, reorganization of traditional forms of economy¹⁰. The development of capitalism leads not to the solution of economic and social problems, but to aggravation of social contradictions, the undermining of political stability due to mass destruction of productive forces in precapitalistic and lower capitalistic structures, tremendous overpopulation and accumulation of poverty in all forms.

Certain international aftereffects of the development of liberated countries in the capitalistic system of the world economy should also be taken into consideration. Within this system, the interaction of the periphery and the center has a very specific characteristic, because the center needs only such development of periphery which meets the objective needs of the monopolistic capital in its growth, and the periphery itself can develop in such a form and degree which fit its internal organization. In the final analysis, this explains why the scientific and technological revolution has never acquired a truly worldwide characteristic within the capitalistic system, and the intensification of the international division of labor was accompanied by a decrease in the share of the developing countries in the international streams of capitals and commodities.

In our opinion, the inability of the liberated countries to form their own formation and the inability of capitalism to transform their multistructural society into a capitalistic formation are the main cause of the lingering structural crisis in these countries from which there can be only one way out -- movement toward socialism. Therefore, it would be essentially wrong to reduce the crisis of capitalism in the liberated countries to the crisis of only its certain stages (early capitalism) or its certain forms (dependent capitalism)¹¹ and especially to assume that the overcoming of these partial crises, if it is possible, can open up a wide field for the development of capitalism in liberated countries during the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, and to open up wide possibilities for economic and social progress to the liberated countries.

Of course, after the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, due to the changes in the power balance in the world economy and modernization of the internal structure of the liberated countries, the rate of their economic development, on the whole, increased. But these countries are still lagging behind the developed countries with respect to the levels of their economic development (both quantitatively, and particularly, qualitatively), and their degree of lagging is increasing in spite of the fact that, with respect to certain key parameters of the development, for example, the norm of accumulation and the degree of participation in the world exchange, they, if, of course, taken as a whole, have approached very closely the developed countries or even outstripped them.

In other words, in spite of the apparent successes achieved by these countries after gaining their national independence, the material and social conditions of the

10. L. Reyner, "Is the Transition from a Formed Structure to the Capitalistic Method of Production Possible?" *AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA* [Asia and Africa Today], 1978, No 1. G. Shirokov, "Technical Progress and the Countries of the East," *AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA*, 1979, No 2.

11. N. Simoniya, "On the Fate of Capitalism in the Countries of Asia," *AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA*, 1979, No 2.

reproductive process in the liberated countries themselves or within the limits of the world economy as a whole have not undergone sufficiently significant changes to commence an extensive and stable process of leveling the world economic development at the present time, and the effectiveness of their own economy and their participation in the international division of labor is still very low.

Advancing the concept of partnership as a general line of the development of the liberated countries, neocolonialists proceeded from the idea that the development of capitalism on the periphery of the world capitalistic economy will not only make it possible to retain these countries as an object of subordination and exploitation, but will also revitalize the weakening organism of its imperialistic center. In turn, certain groups of the local capital, supporting this concept, expected that its realization would strengthen the edifice of capitalism in the liberated countries and would open the door for them to the world capitalistic market. However, it can be stated that these attempts were only partially successful.

Of course, the joint efforts of foreign and local capital to accomplish the described model of development will persistently continue. But, on the whole, possibilities of its realization are less favorable at the present time than in the past, because the open door policy with respect to foreign private capital in the countries where it was followed resulted in the aggravation of economic and social contradictions, and intensive use of foreign help at the governmental level led to an increase of foreign debts and aggravation of the solvency problem. The strategy of the export orientation also did not yield the desired results, particularly in those liberated countries where the development of the export sector was not reinforced by the creation of a national economic complex and progressive reforms in the internal socio-economic structure. It was no coincidence that in the nineteen seventies the liberated countries started fighting actively for the reorganization of international economic relations, and the tendency toward the changeover to the noncapitalistic path of development became stronger and stronger in a considerable part of these countries.

The growing polarization among the liberated countries themselves should also be taken into consideration. Although, on the whole, the development of these countries has undoubtedly accelerated, only some of them which were in particularly favorable conditions have been able to approach the developed countries with respect to their income, while the distance separating the bulk of the liberated countries from the developed countries has increased even more. A particularly grave situation formed in the group of the least developed countries which were the least prepared for economic progress and suffered the most from inflation and from the energy and food crises.

But experience has shown that even the highest rates of the growth and the most advantageous conditions of exchange do not at all guarantee for these countries any social progress, growth of consumption and employment for everyone, and a more or less even distribution of profits and wealth. In fact, at the present time, over five percent of the workers of the developing countries are totally unemployed and another 30% are partially unemployed, and the data on the distribution of the income indicate a very high degree of their polarization: the upper 20% of the population receive 56% of the income, while the lower 40% receive only 14%, and 60% of the population of these countries are completely beyond the poverty barrier, i.e., they do not even have the minimum means of subsistence¹².

12. "Nauchno-tekhnicheskii progress i zanyatost' v razvivayushchikhsya stranakh" [Scientific and Technical Progress and Employment in Developing Countries], Moscow, 1977, pp 14-16.

This is, essentially, the main economic and social result of the present phase and form of the social development of the former colonies and semicolonies which demonstrates in the best way possible the weakness of the potentialities of capitalism and its inability to develop itself and to develop others. It is no coincidence that almost the entire postcolonial history of the liberated countries is the interlacing of the struggle between different variants of the development of capitalism with the struggle against all forms of exploitation, including capitalistic.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki", 1980

10,233
CSO: 1870

INTERNATIONAL

PETROVSKIY ON NEED TO CONTINUE DETENTE

Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA in Russian No 1, Jan-Feb 81 signed to press 6 Jan 81 pp 3-20

[Article by Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, doctor of historical sciences, member of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Collegium, senior scientific worker at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of U.S.A. and Canada, author of the monographs "Zagranichnaya sluzhba Velikobritanii" [Great Britain's Foreign Service] (Moscow 1958), "Diplomatiya Dauning Strit" [Downing Street Diplomacy] (Moscow 1964), "Amerikanskaya vneshnepoliticheskaya mysl'" [American Foreign Policy Concepts] (Moscow 1976) and "Doktrina 'natsional'noy bezopasnosti' v global'noy strategii SSHA" [The Doctrine of "National Security" in U.S. Global Strategy]: "The USSR's Struggle for Detente in the Seventies"]

[Text] Under the conditions of the present balance of forces in the world, when along with the Soviet Union, a number of the countries of Europe and Asia, and also Latin America, are marching along the road of the building of socialism and communism, and when the three main revolutionary detachments of the age have become a decisive factor in world development, the CPSU is placing on its agenda for international life the question of strengthening a durable and stable, and at the same time just and democratic peace in the world. At the present stage of world development, the CPSU sees the only possible way to insuring such a peace in detente, that is, in the removal of the tension arising within the structure of international relations primarily as the result of the "cold war" policy pursued in the postwar years by the imperialist states. Detente is regarded by the Soviet Union not as a static condition but a dynamic process in the course of which there is a restructuring of international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Having achieved the implementation of a number of important provisions in the foreign policy program of the CPSU 24th and 25th congresses, the Soviet Union made a decisive contribution to the development and consolidation of detente. On the threshold of the CPSU 26th Congress, the CPSU Central Committee June (1980) Plenum confirmed the unalterable nature of the course toward reducing the danger of war, strengthening international security and limiting the arms race. CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium L.I. Brezhnev stressed: "We remain true to the Peace Program put forward by our party's 24th and 25th congresses. Accordingly, now, in the eighties, as earlier in the seventies, we are for the consolidation and not the destruction of detente. For reductions not increases in arms. For rapprochement and mutual understanding among peoples, and not for artificial estrangement and enmity."

When assessing detente from today's positions and the marked complications of the international situation, it is impossible not to see that the results of this policy achieved during the seventies represent one of the decisive factors beneficially affecting present international relations. It can be asserted on very good grounds that it has penetrated deeply into people's consciousness and into the fabric of world policy, and has won for itself a fitting status in interstate relations.

Now, no one except the representatives of the extreme reactionary and militarist circles intends to cast aside the concept of detente from his own political lexicon. It is a word used by those who are seriously disturbed by the prospects in the further development of the international situation and the fate of peace, and by those who are concerned only for their own self-interests and who have only short-term political ambitions. The crux of the matter, of course, lies not in the attractiveness of this meaningful and energetic word. The main thing is that by signifying a surmounting of the "cold war" and the switch to normal, equal relations between states, detente represents a true call of the times. The ways and forms of the historical antagonism between the two different social systems and the fate of peace depend largely on how this matter is preserved and moved forward. The only alternative to detente is the threat of mankind's self-annihilation in nuclear war. In other words, under present conditions, it is objectively necessary.

The lessons from the struggle for this judicious political course during the seventies also indicate something else: it is not only necessary but entirely possible. And it is to an analysis of these lessons that this article is devoted. In contrast to other work by Soviet authors dealing with this problem, attention here is given mainly to an evaluation of the place and role of detente in the structure of present-day international relations and in the formation of a lasting and stable peace.

* * *

Detente is the result not of some chance concurrence of circumstances but of the objective course of development in present-day international relations and of the historical process that is being reinforced by the political will of states. Its integral parts are the shifts in the balance of power in the world arena in favor of socialism and in particular in the establishment of military strategic balance between the USSR and the United States, between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and of NATO, which is a factor restraining the desire of imperialist and hegemonistic forces; the strengthening of the world socialist system; the stability in the economic growth and social development of the socialist community; the breakup of colonial empires and the increased role of the developing countries; and scientific and technical progress, particularly in the field of developing weapons lethal for all mankind.

The purposeful, peace-loving policy of the Soviet State "opened up" the road to detente. The Peace Program adopted at the CPSU 24th Congress and developed further at the CPSU 25th Congress was timely in pointing out the possibilities that had been opened up for confirming in international relations the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different systems. The Soviet Union was timely in utilizing these possibilities. Along with the Soviet Union,

the countries of the socialist community march in the leading ranks of the warriors of detente. The member countries of the nonaligned movement have promoted the affirmation of detente and made a growing contribution to it. No small role has been played by the growing influence of the peace-loving public, in particular the upsurge of antiwar sentiment in the West at the turn of the seventies. Neither is it possible not to note the significant turnabout to realism at that time by the political leaders of the major capitalist countries, many of whom concluded that negotiation on disputed questions and peaceful coexistence are preferable to balancing on the edge of war and confrontation.

Relaxation of tension was initiated in the sphere of bilateral relations. The transfer to this from "cold war" policy was marked in the mid-sixties. And it was quite law-governed that the breakthrough on the "cold war" front occurred in Europe where half the population lives under the conditions of socialism. Development of the process of detente in Europe was largely the result of the agreed peace policy of the Warsaw Pact member states.

The first major country of Europe to set out on the path of detente during the sixties was France. It reviewed the foreign policy concepts of the "cold war" and withdrew from the NATO military organization, as a result of which its territory was freed from the presence of NATO forces and military establishments and bases.

In June 1966 during an official visit to the USSR by the French president Charles de Gaulle, the foundation was laid for renewed relations between the two states, which were later reinforced and developed by the purposeful, practical work of the two countries.

The signing in 1971 of the Principles of Cooperation between the USSR and France and the Soviet-French declaration, which organically incorporated the basic elements of the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, was of paramount significance for improving the political climate in Europe and lessening international tension. The constructive cooperation established between the two countries was extended to both the political and other spheres of interstate relations. The political consultations held regularly at various levels, including summit level, make it possible for the USSR and France to understand each other's positions in order to bring them closer on a certain number of topics under discussion. In many ways the policy of accord and cooperation between the USSR and France became the starting point of detente and the restructuring of East-West relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

The shift in relations with the FRG also played an important part in detente. One major event on the international scale was the signing on 12 August 1970 in Moscow of the Agreement between the USSR and the FRG that fixed the inviolability of the existing borders in Europe, including the border between the GDR and the FRG, and also the western border of Poland, and, taking this into account, contained pledges to refrain from the use of force or the threat of force. It was part of a comprehensive accord between the parties that the FRG would also normalize relations with Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia. Thus was laid one of the cornerstones in the edifice of the relaxation of tension.

Soviet-West German relations were normalized following the entry into force of the 1970 Moscow Treaty. The conclusion in 1971 of the quadripartite agreement that confirmed that West Berlin does not belong to the FRG and cannot be governed by it promoted relaxation of the situation, along with normalization of relations between the GDR and the FRG. On this subject the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU wrote that this agreement "means that finally a practical policy is being pursued under the banner of sane thinking."³ The joint USSR-FRG declaration of 6 May 1978, which confirmed the will of the two states to pursue a course of detente, also played an important role.

The favorable development of relations between the USSR and Great Britain, Italy, Canada, Japan, Austria, Belgium and other capitalist countries also promoted progress in detente. Traditional good-neighborly ties with Finland were developed and enriched. The establishment of diplomatic relations with Portugal and the upgrading of these relations with Greece were a reflection of the positive changes in the political atmosphere in Europe.

Against a background of broad application of the principles of cooperation in the relations between the USSR and France, the FRG and other capitalist countries, under conditions in which the idea of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems had become steadily filled with specific content and was embracing increasingly extensive fields in interstate ties, the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the CPSU 24th Congress contained a proposal to improve relations with the United States.

Influenced by the widespread feelings among their own allies in favor of a restructuring of Soviet-U.S. relations, and recognizing the bankrupt nature of the "cold war," the U.S. leaders were forced to abandon confrontation and to negotiate with the Soviet Union on the basis of equality. During the last decade a number of Soviet-U.S. summit-level meetings took place and L.I. Brezhnev and A.A. Gromyko had a large number of talks with the U.S. Secretary of State in Moscow and with the U.S. President when the USSR Foreign Minister visited Washington and New York. In a short time historically considerable work was done to restructure Soviet-U.S. relations. As a result of these meetings between the USSR and the United States a broad legal-agreement basis was created for a policy of detente.⁴ Documents such as the Bases for Mutual Relations between the USSR and the United States (1972), the Treaty between the USSR and the United States To Prevent Nuclear War (1973), the Treaty between the USSR and the United States To Limit Antimissile Systems (1972) and the Interim Agreement between the USSR and the United States on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitations of Strategic Offensive Arms (1972) were of special international significance.

It was noted in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the CPSU 25th Congress that the Soviet-U.S. documents in their entirety had laid a solid political and legal basis for the development of mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and the United States on the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated its readiness to pursue the path of detente in relations with the United States. In 1979 a meeting took place in Vienna between

L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the U.S. President, J. Carter. Its results--primarily the signing of a second agreement on limiting strategic arms--SALT II--were called upon to give new impetus to the process of normalizing the international political climate.⁵ The Soviet side strove to achieve this goal also at meetings that took place in May and September of 1980 between the USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and the U.S. Secretary of State B. Muskie.

In its turn, detente in relations between the USSR and the United States served as a real stimulus for further restructuring of relations between the USSR and other capitalist states on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutual cooperation. During the seventies, relations between the socialist and capitalist countries entered a new stage characterized by the establishment of political cooperation between states with opposed social systems, dictated by the interests of preventing nuclear missile war and insuring peace, security and international cooperation.

It is extremely characteristic that for the Soviet Union the decisive turn to detente signified a natural development in the consistently pursued course of transforming international relations in accordance with the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, whereas for the political leadership of the capitalist countries, and primarily the United States, it was necessary to make a quite radical reappraisal of its own foreign policy in order to move away from the "cold war" and confrontation with the Soviet Union to negotiation with it. The recognition by the figures who at that time were at the helm of power in the countries of the capitalist world of the futility and senselessness of counting on nuclear force was of decisive significance in the reappraisal of the possible and the attainable. And the fact is that it was not the means of waging war themselves that turned out to be more than enough to achieve foreign policy aims, as some bourgeois researchers try to assert. History proves that imperialism has never hesitated to use force in order to realize its plans. The leadership of the capitalist world came to the idea of the need to reduce the danger of nuclear war as a result of understanding that the other side--the Soviet Union--also possesses the same kind of military power as the nuclear powers in the West, primarily the United States. Speaking at the Council for International Relations in Saint Louis (Missouri) on 12 May 1975, former U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger said that the USSR and the United States "face a problem without historical precedent: each of these powers possesses weapons capable of destroying civilized life. Therefore, no matter how we compete between ourselves and no matter what the ideological opposition, neither of these powers can attempt to impose its will on the other without taking an unacceptable risk."⁶

Another important conclusion on the need to maintain military strategic balance between the USSR and the United States and between the two military and political alliances in Europe was linked with the recognition of the danger of a mutually destructive nuclear catastrophe. Addressing members of the Southern Conference of the Producers of raw materials and fondutuffs in Birmingham (Alabama) on 14 August 1975, the same H. Kissinger stressed that "never before in history have the weapons of war been so vast, so dangerous, and at the same time so unsuitable for furthering

the achievement of political aims.... We have no task more important than that of maintaining strategic equilibrium since otherwise we threaten our own survival.⁷⁾ During the first half of the seventies the U.S. political leadership did not limit itself merely to stating the fact of strategic parity. It reached the rather more long-term conclusion that any attempts to upset this parity cannot be crowned with any substantial, and, more to the point, long-term effect. If parity is upset it will inevitably be reestablished, but at a higher level of weapons system development. The withdrawal of the capitalist states from their earlier foreign policy doctrines and lines was necessitated by the appearance of realistic thinking on the part of a number of the leaders of the Western powers and the of the deepening of the crisis in imperialism's inherently aggressive international policy. It became possible as the result of the change in the world in which we live and as the result of the bold, creative policy of the CPSU, its Central Committee, and the Central Committee Politburo.

The restructuring of bilateral relations between the USSR and other socialist countries and the leading capitalist states on the bases of peaceful coexistence made it possible to move detente to a qualitatively new stage of collective efforts by states to insure security and cooperation. Starting from the mid-sixties the Soviet Union along with the other socialist countries consistently strove for the convocation of an all-European conference.⁸⁾ In July 1966 the socialist countries united in the Warsaw Pact Organization came out at a meeting in Bucharest with a program for security and peaceful cooperation in Europe. This program was supported at the Conference of European Communist and Workers Parties in Karlovy Vary in April 1967. Specific proposals linked with the preparation and convocation of an all-European forum on security and cooperation were put forward at meetings of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in Budapest (1969), Moscow (1970), Berlin (1970) and Prague (1972), and also at sessions of their foreign ministers in Prague (1972), Budapest (1970), Bucharest (1971) and Warsaw (1971). Thanks to the active and agreed actions of the Warsaw Pact countries, questions of insuring security in Europe were placed at the center of European policy and the proposal for the convocation of an all-European conference became the subject of businesslike negotiations.

The initiative and stubborn work to prepare and successfully hold the all-European conference on security and cooperation in Helsinki with the participation of the United States and Canada pertains to the outstanding successes of agreed political actions by the socialist countries in the international arena. Having traversed a long and difficult road, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on 1 August 1975 adopted an historic document ratified by the signatures of the top leaders of 33 European states and also the United States and Canada. In this document, representing collective understanding on a broad range of urgent problems, were recorded, in particular, 10 principles for relations by which all participants pledged themselves to be guided in European affairs.⁹⁾ The signing in Helsinki of Final Act of the All-European Conference was a major event affecting the situation not only in Europe but throughout the world. A.A. Gromyko remarked: "The agreements reached at the conference will place relations between the participating countries on the firmer base of the principles of peaceful coexistence and they define specific directions and forms for cooperation in the various spheres of life and lay the foundations for a reliable peace in Europe. Summing up the results of the past,

they specify a broad and precise program for actions by the states on a unilateral, bilateral and multilateral basis for many years, possibly decades, ahead."¹⁰

The Final Act of the All-European Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in its totality is, of course, a compromise representing a balance of the interests of all 35 countries belonging to different socioeconomic systems, but it is a compromise that results from the recognition by the capitalist states of the need to build relations in the modern world on the only possible basis--peaceful coexistence that envisages nonintervention in each other's affairs. The soundness and acceptability of this agreement lie in the fact that it was achieved in the interests of strengthening peace and confirming the rights of peoples to free, independent development and at the same time does not affect the differences in the ideology and social systems of the countries participating in the conference. Assessing the results of the Helsinki forum and in particular the solemn pledge "to expand and deepen the process of detente and make it progressive and stable," the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers noted that "the agreements reached as a result of the conference are in accord with those principles of peaceful coexistence and international cooperation and the peace and freedom of peoples that were worked out by V.I. Lenin and that the Soviet state has defended along the entire path of its history."¹¹

As can now be clearly seen, five years after Helsinki the birth of the Final Act has opened up broad prospects for peaceful development and has served as an impetus for the further advance of the process of detente. What has happened has not been simply mutual supplementation of bilateral and multilateral relations but the extension of cooperation in Europe in all directions. On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Helsinki conference, L.I. Brezhnev stated: "If we look at the course of European development not through the prism of the moment but in the historical perspective, there is no road back to Helsinki. Like the UN Charter, the Final Act is facilitating the transfer of human civilization to new and higher levels in international relations."¹² The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are consistently following a line to implement the agreements contained in the Final Act, in all their directions. They are striving for recognition of the principles adopted in Helsinki as the laws of international life. In this sphere the Soviet Union has displayed an historic initiative, having included in its constitution all ten principles of the Final Act.

Detente is affecting all aspects of interstate relations in Europe. Political mutual relations between the European socialist and capitalist countries have begun to acquire a new, stable character. Positions on observance of principles in relations between states have been reinforced in agreements and other documents signed in recent years between the Soviet Union and France, the FRG, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Finland, Sweden and Denmark, and also between a number of other countries. It has been possible to achieve not insubstantial results in the development of equal trade and economic, scientific and technical and cultural ties between the capitalist and socialist states of Europe. The total volume of trade among them has reached about \$60 billion annually (in 1965 the total was only \$8.3 billion). New agreements have recently been concluded whose fulfillment will insure further growth in trade.¹³ A comprehensive, long-term foundation has been laid under economic cooperation with countries such as France, the FRG and Finland.

Detente has enriched the traditional forms of interstate exchange in Europe and created new ones. Summit-level meetings and conferences have become a powerful accelerator in the positive changes in international relations. Mechanisms for political consultations whose thematic and geographic range is being systematically extended have been firmly introduced into mutual relations between states with different sociopolitical systems.

A useful contribution to the development of cooperation in Europe has been made by multilateral measures on concrete questions agreed upon at the 1978 Belgrade meeting of representatives from the states participating in the Helsinki conference: meetings of experts to work out a generally accepted method for the peaceful settlement of disputes and an all-European scientific forum, together with forums on economic, scientific and technical and cultural cooperation in the Mediterranean area. The scientific forum of representatives of these states that took place in 1980 in Hamburg was of positive significance.

The Final Act adopted in Helsinki has become a landmark in European affairs, a kind of yardstick for affirming the relations of peace and cooperation. It has demonstrated graphically that the restructuring of international relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems is not only conceivable in principle but also in the practical implementation of the matter.

Detente, which has demonstrated its viability and that it produces results in Europe, which experienced to the greatest degree all the costs and danger of the "cold war," has been adopted as a purposeful foreign policy position also by the countries of other regions and continents. It has received universal recognition in the United Nations, which in December 1977 adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union the Declaration on Deepening and Consolidating the Relaxation of International Tension. In this declaration it speaks of the pressing need for detente "to embrace all regions of the world and promote the settlement of unresolved international problems peacefully by means of participation and cooperation among states."¹⁴ In the process of detente--and this, perhaps, is the most important thing--a start has been made on the formation of a system of lasting peace, a peace based not on the balance of terror but on equal security and trust between countries, on the active participation of all states, large and small, in insuring international security and developing mutually beneficial cooperation. Detente has insured a turn away from "cold war" and confrontation toward negotiation and cooperation, and has thus made both the atmosphere and the very essence of international relations more healthy.

The military strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the two military-political alliances in Europe became a realistic condition for insuring peace and security. It required much effort on the part of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving forces to make the principle of equality and equal security--an important one in the mutual relations between the USSR and the United States as the two greatest powers--applicable to all states and in employing the principle of not causing detriment to the security of any of the parties.

Their implementation in the practical relations between states with different social systems is a complex problem because of the differences in their political aims and because of the differences in the structure of military organizations, geostrategic situations and so forth. The task arises of eliminating tendencies toward acquiring unilateral advantages at the expense of the security of the other side, and of renouncing aspirations to military superiority and finding the kinds of formulas that would insure mutually acceptable balance of interests. Security, both international and national, and forward movement in the sphere of military relaxation depend largely on how consistently they will be realized. The positions of the sides on the idea of national and international security based on military balance have been brought much closer together on the basis of these principles. Political flexibility in the search for mutually satisfactory, equal solutions has begun to stand in marked contrast to the old principle upheld in the times of world wars and the "cold war"—whatever is good for one side is bad for the other."

Whereas in the past it was considered that security was insured first by the maximum disposition of force, detente has demonstrated that political wisdom lies not in the uncontrolled buildup of arms but in agreement to mutual restraint. The circumstance to which the socialist countries have long been pointing has become particularly obvious: the best road to security is not an arms race but the limitation and reduction of arms. It is stated in the final document of the 24 May-30 June 1978 UN General Assembly special session on disarmament in New York that "The achievement of security is one of the inalienable elements of peace and has always been an aim that answers the deepest yearnings of mankind. From ancient times states have striven to insure security for themselves by means of the possession of arms. It must be recognized that in some circumstances their existence has in fact been determined by the fact that they possessed the appropriate means of defense. However, the buildup of arms, especially nuclear arms, is today rather a threat and not a protection for future peoples. The time has therefore come to make an end to the proposition, to ban the use of force in international relations, and to set about finding security through disarmament, that is, by means of a gradual but effective process that will begin with the gradual reduction of the present level of arms."¹⁵

The prospect of strengthening both general and national security by means of implementing measures limiting the arms of states has been opened up thanks to the results to which the consistent struggle of the Soviet Union for the relaxation of international tension and for greater trust and a higher level of cooperation between states with different social systems has led. The chief achievement of this policy is that it has been possible to really lessen the threat of war and to break the tragic circle when peace was merely a breathing space between world wars.

A start has been made in the process of detente to implementing a whole complex of measures to create the material guarantees of peace. A number of agreements restricting the sphere of the arms race and limiting weapons buildups have been signed and gone into effect: the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof,¹⁶ the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction¹⁷ and the Convention on the Prohibition of Military and any other Hostile Use of Means to Affect the Natural Environment.¹⁸

The first frontiers have been passed on the road to limiting strategic arms and thus curbing the growth of arms in the most dangerous direction. The Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT-I) signed in Moscow in 1972 fixed the balance of strategic forces for the USSR and the United States and created definite obstacles against the intensification of their nuclear opposition. The Treaty between the USSR and the United States on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT-II) signed in Vienna on 18 June 1979 opened up prospects for limiting both the quantitative and qualitative growth of strategic arms; however, its ratification was frozen by the Carter administration. All the most important nuclear powers--the USSR, the United States, Britain and France--are linked by the understandings on preventing the outbreak of accidental, unsanctioned war. For the first time measures of trust such as notification of military exercises and inviting observers to military maneuvers, placed on a basis of international law, are designed to remove suspicion about the military activity of states.

Now discussion concerns the further development and intensification of both political and legal guarantees of peace: rejection of the use of force in international relations, strengthening guarantees of security for the non-nuclear governments, achievement of an agreement among the participants in the all-European conference against a preemptive strike with either nuclear or conventional weapons.

Considered in the historical and political context, all these act signify that new and important criteria and law-governed patterns are being formed in the military sphere of international relations. Another political style has emerged in solving the questions of war and peace.

Detente had produced substantial results in the efforts of states in the direction of preventing and liquidating conflict and crisis situations. It is appropriate to recall that the fourth Israeli-Arab war in October 1973 did not assume threatening proportions and did not entail catastrophic consequences in part because under the conditions of detente it was possible to seek effective means to end it. Having given aid to Egypt and Syria, the victims of Israeli aggression, the Soviet Union made efforts to liquidate this military conflict. Thanks to the combined actions of the USSR and the United States, which were possible under the conditions of detente, it was possible to extinguish a dangerous armed conflict in the Middle East. Speaking in the Indian parliament on 29 November 1973, L.I. Brezhnev remarked that "if the factor of detente, which has appeared in the past two or three years, had not been present, the matter would have been quite different. If the present conflict had occurred in a situation of general international tension and exacerbation of relations, let us say, between the United States and the Soviet Union, the clash in the Middle East could have become much more dangerous and could have assumed proportions threatening universal peace."¹⁹

Nevertheless, despite the progress made, during the seventies it was not possible to stop the arms race and completely get rid of conflicts and crises. Here it must be borne in mind that in addition to socioeconomic causes for these phenomena, detente itself was still only in the stage of being formed. The further development and deepening of the processes of detente would undoubtedly promote trust between states and accordingly would increase the efficiency of actions undertaken jointly to limit the arms race, strengthen the political guarantees of peace and resolve crisis situations. The Final Act of the All-European Conference, in particular, affects this aspect of the implementation of detente, progress in realizing agreements that have been achieved rests directly on the level of detente.

The same can be said of the global problems of the age, such as eliminating the gap between industrially developed and developing countries, and questions of food and environmental protection. And here detente serves as an essential prerequisite for solving these really important problems that face all mankind. A statement by the Soviet Government on this question says: "An important mutual link exists between the restructuring of international economic relations and the problems of limiting the arms race, disarmament and the strengthening of security, namely, further progress in political and military detente, which is of paramount significance in strengthening universal peace, will at the same time promote the normalization of the world economic situation. In its turn, progress in the sphere of restructuring international economic relations will contribute to the deepening and expansion of the relaxation of tension."²⁰ Materialization of detente has turned out to be a far from easy matter. The CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government have warned that implementation of proclaimed principles and agreements requires from the Soviet Union and all peace-loving countries serious new steps to overcome difficulties and obstacles created by forces that oppose the cause of peace and detente.

From the very start the development of the processes of detente has been taking place in a struggle against those who have attempted to frustrate or at least slow down the restructuring of international relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. This struggle assumed an especially acute nature when, following the working out of the principles of international relations in Europe, its own kind of code for detente, the question of supplementing political detente with military detente came onto the agenda. This kind of course in the development of events was not to the liking of the militarist circles, the rulers of the military-industrial complex in the capitalist countries, primarily in the United States. From the very first steps of detente, other influential forces in the U.S. ruling class have been acting in concord with them against it--many oil monopolies, politicians and officials who have tied their careers to anticommunism and militarism, many of the mass information media and Zionist circles. Having strengthened existing headquarters and created new ones (the American Council for Security, the American Conservative Union, the Committee on the Present Danger, the Coalition for Peace from a Position of Strength), the enemies of detente in the United States, who on the authoritative evidence of the American political figure and historian G. Kennan, "yearn for an arms race like drug addicts," decided, come what may, to upset the military balance that had been created in the world and strive for the United States to achieve a position of superior military force, and for this purpose to set out on the road of inflaming chauvinistic attitudes within the country, and they developed a campaign unprecedented in scale about the so-called "Soviet military threat." At the same time they made demands for a renunciation of political detente. The march toward detente also stimulated the desire of the monopoly bourgeoisie to extricate themselves from the sharpening internal socioeconomic contradictions in capitalist society, having choked by talk about an external threat the growing dissatisfaction of the working masses. Since in fact all the most important means of mass information are in the hands of the enemies of detente, their voice was disproportionately loud relative to the social base that they have.

It is impossible not to see that the influence of rightist forces does not proceed without leaving a trace. Under their influence the leaders of the NATO military bloc, and primarily the United States, set out at the end of the seventies on a course of upsetting the military balance that had been established in the world in their own favor and to the detriment of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and to the detriment of international relaxation and security. After the numerous swings and oscillations noted during the first two years of the Carter administration, in its foreign policy, oriented from the very start on the establishment of American hegemony in world affairs, the stake was laid on military force. In the spring of 1980 the presidential aide on national security Z. Brzezinski stated: "We should be able to demonstrate our power and show everyone clearly that the United States can use it."²¹

In May 1978, under pressure from the United States, the Washington session of the NATO Council approved a supplemental long-term program for the arms race, oriented on a stable, three-percent increase in real military expenditure by the countries of the bloc. In December 1979 the Brussels session of the NATO Council adopted a resolution, under strong pressure from Washington, to produce and deploy in West Europe a new U.S. nuclear missile means--medium range weapons. It is planned to deploy about 600 Tomahawk and Pershing-2 winged missiles on the territories of the FRG, Britain, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands. Thus, it is intended to introduce into the nuclear balance a qualitatively new component--supplementing the means available to the U.S. forward bases and the corresponding means of Great Britain and France, already capable of reaching the USSR, with the deployment of the new U.S. missiles. This, naturally, would lead to a change in favor of NATO in the entire strategic situation in Europe, and not only in Europe.

At the same time, in December 1979 President J. Carter announced a 5-year program for the further buildup of the United States' military forces. In this program it was intended to constantly increase military expenditure in real terms by an average of 4.6 percent annually. Provision was made for the expansion and qualitative upgrading of the arsenal of strategic arms, in particular the development of 200 mobile MX ICBM's, development of the Trident submarine system, and of air-to-ground strategic cruise missiles. The 5-year militarist program also envisages a forced buildup in conventional forces, including the U.S. armed forces in NATO and in the Pacific and Indian oceans. A "rapid deployment force" intended for interventionist actions by the United States is being created at a rapid pace for the practical implementation of the so-called "Carter doctrine" with whose aid a U.S. military presence in any part of the world stated to be "in the vital interests" of the United States is justified.

The weapons buildup in the United States has been accompanied by a switch from a strategy accentuating "retaliation" and based on the premise of "complete mutual destruction" to an offensive strategy of counteraction ("compensation") that provides for the possibility of preventive nuclear strikes and the waging of nuclear war with the aid of increasingly refined and accurate kinds of weapons.²² Published at the beginning of August 1980, Presidential Directive No 59 states that "limited nuclear war" is an instrument for achieving U.S. geopolitical aims and is oriented on the development of a potential for delivering a preemptive strike on military targets in the Soviet Union and thus substantially lowers the threshold for the permissibility of nuclear conflict.²³

The course toward militarization has also appeared in the approach of the United States and its NATO allies to disarmament talks. The United States has put off ratification of the SALT-II Agreement, broken off talks on the Indian Ocean and deliveries of conventional weapons, and dragged its heels on solving questions on many other negotiations on disarmament. Long before the events in Afghanistan--as confesses B. Blackman, former deputy director of the U.S. Agency for Weapons Control and Disarmament--"the administration's enthusiasm for limiting arms had become, to put it mildly, restrained."²⁴

On the basis of hostility to the cause of peace a partnership is being arranged between the aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily the United States, and the Peking hegemonists, who, pursuing their own great-power aims, are trying to frustrate the relaxation of tension, preaching the inevitability of a new world war and making active preparations for it, and laying claim to the territory of neighboring states and organizing provocations against them. Along with intensive material preparation for war, imperialist and hegemonist forces are organizing unprecedented anti-Soviet propaganda campaigns and sharpening the ideological struggle, which is acquiring the nature of ideological sabotage and "psychological warfare." Trying to impose their will on other states, U.S. ruling circles have set out on the road of economic "sanctions" and the curtailment of scientific and technical, cultural and sports links, refusing to make commitments and violating agreements and understandings they have signed. Antisovietism and anticommunism have become an instrument for whipping up the arms race and a weapon in the struggle not only against the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community, but also against all enemies of war and peace-loving forces, and a means of undermining detente. The result of all this has been a worsening of the international situation that is fraught with serious dangers for the cause of peace.

Trying to justify and camouflage their line aimed at undermining the relaxation of international tension and at the gigantic buildup of arms, aggressive circles in the United States and NATO have recently unleashed an unprecedented antisoviet campaign in connection with the events in Afghanistan. They are trying to present almost as a "threat to international peace" the aid from the Soviet Union, offered at the request of the Afghan Government. When the question is presented in this way, everything is turned on its head. The real threat to peace is somewhere else--in the actions of imperialist forces and in that dangerous trend that in recent years has been visible increasingly clearly in the policy of the United States and the NATO military bloc. Exaggeration of the so-called Afghan question is by no means the only propaganda cover with which aggressive circles are attempting to hide the intensification of militarist activity in NATO and the expansion of its function as a weapon of the imperialist diktat.

The NATO political leadership is now strongly pushing a concept in which they are trying to make the incompatible compatible: detente and an arms buildup. On 12 December 1979 U.S. President J. Carter asserted: "Unremitting American might is the only possible basis for for a broader, truly mutual relaxation of tension that we are trying to achieve in relations with the USSR." And, speaking in the parliament on 10 November 1979, British Prime Minister M. Thatcher stated: "If we want to negotiate on disarmament then we must do it from a position of strength and not from a position of weakness. We must bring our own arms up to strength and modernize them completely."

Behind the thesis that strengthening the West's military potential allegedly does not contradict detente but on the contrary constitutes an essential prerequisite for it lie calculations to insure military superiority and solve international problems from the positions of force.

It is typical that while expatiating on detente, in fact some of the heads of state in NATO not only are not adopting suggestions from the socialist countries aimed at strengthening detente but have themselves not once made any kind of constructive initiative in favor of reducing tension.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist communist decisively refute the doctrine of military superiority and as a counterweight to it propose carrying out a gradual reduction in the total level of military opposition and have immediately started to reduce the arms race. Here they stress that in the long term the parallel existence of a reduction in international tension and an arms race is not possible. The arms race leads only to mutual mistrust between peoples and brings to nought what has been achieved by the labor of mankind and hampers or makes impossible the world's comprehensive socioeconomic development.

Detente cannot be consolidated or international security strengthened under conditions of a buildup of weapons of mass destruction. The arms race unleashed by imperialism is increasing many times over the danger of war, in particular of a global nuclear conflict, and makes achievement of the aims of disarmament more remote.²⁵ This all removes any kind of justification for asserting that the process of detente is compatible with arms stockpiling.

Another circumstance in the interpretation of the policy of detente in the United States is also typical. Whereas earlier in the United States they used to talk unceasingly about it as "a one-way street" of late they do not openly call into question its advantage and usefulness for all countries, but stress something else, namely its indivisibility. Hypocritically speculating on this thesis, U.S. politicians and ideologists (Z. Brzezinski, P. Nietsche, R. Pipes, A. Ulan) deliberately confuse interstate relations, in which sphere this policy operates, with socioeconomic processes in order, under the pretext of the "indivisibility of detente" to hinder the social shifts taking place in the world. At the practical level, social changes in any given country that are disagreeable for Washington are used to freeze efforts directed at political or military detente.

Of course, detente, like peace, is indivisible. A profound interaction exists between economic, social and political processes taking place in various countries and parts of the world and the general process of developing a world economy and a world policy. This signifies the need not only for following in interstate relations in every continent and every part of the world the generally accepted norms of international law, the UN Charter and other basic documents of the world society, but also for applying in mutual relations with states in other parts those principles and methods that have shown their effectiveness, while, of course, taking into account the specific political situation. In this way, success in the cause of peace in any corner of the globe would become active for all world policy and would stimulate subsequent steps to strengthen international security. At the same time, the Soviet Union constantly stresses that solving the problems of international

security, such as guaranteed peaceful coexistence between states with different systems, not only does not signify a "freeze" in the sociopolitical status quo but on the contrary creates favorable external conditions for each people to exercise its rights to establish the kind of social order and the kinds of internal methods that it considers expedient in order to insure the economic, social and cultural progress of its own country.

While accusing the Soviet Union of allegedly pursuing a policy of "limited" or "selective" detente, the above-mentioned U.S. politicians and ideologists thus turn everything upside down. In fact, from the very first days that it came to power, the Carter administration began to pursue such a policy, setting out on the road of withdrawal from the joint Soviet-U.S. agreements of 1972-1976 and unleashing a new round of the arms race, provoking conflict situations, and organizing numerous antisoviet campaigns. The idea of "limited" or "selective" detente is organically alien to socialist foreign policy which fights for the extension of detente to all spheres of interstate relations and to all parts of the world. As for the concept of "limited" detente mooted by Washington, it has been, in the apt definition of the Bulgarian scientist A. Todorov, "scientifically groundless and politically reactionary." Since it is openly anticommunist and antisoviet, it is also openly utopian, since it attempts to hinder the policy of detente and the world revolutionary process.²⁶

One integral part of the interpretation by some U.S. circles of the policy of detente continues to remain the demands for "ideological cooling" as a prerequisite for it.²⁷ Nothing is more absurd than to make such a demand. The process of detente is taking place at the level of interstate relations and is regulated by appropriate agreements that in no way deal with the differences of views, ideas and ideology stemming from the socioeconomic nature of different states.

It is quite obvious that the various kinds of negotiations that have taken place in official U.S. circles concerning detente are being used for purposes that have nothing in common with real detente. It is not fortuitous that American "rules of behavior" are being suggested as a "code for detente"--rules that offer the United States the opportunity to intervene high-handedly in the internal affairs of other peoples and to impose its will on them.²⁸ These kinds of negotiations on detente have as their aim the emasculation of the real content of this concept and the conversion of detente into a cover for pursuing a policy of bellicose hegemonism and anticommunism. On this subject, the above-mentioned A. Todorov rightly remarks that those who preach similar views "are acting in essence not for the turnabout of international relations but for the 'turnabout' of socialism onto the road of self-degeneration."²⁹

Of course, the policy of detente will not be effective if the generally accepted standards of behavior are not followed, a different content is imparted to it and it is interpreted perversely and obliquely, and if two detentes come out of the concept, one, say, for the West and another for the East. The correct, generally accepted evaluation of the essence of detente largely also predetermines the proper practical policy, while a false evaluation usually leads to erroneous actions.

At the same time there is no need to search for some kind of new rules of behavior, the so-called code for detente about which they are making such a noise in the West. There is already a code for detente. It consists of the very important documents jointly drawn up by the socialist and capitalist countries, primarily the Final Act of the Helsinki conference. And the more consistently they are implemented, the greater the benefit derived by each of the parties that affixed its signature to these documents.

Those U.S. politicians and ideologists who think realistically, with complete justification refute attempts to distort the mutually agreed formulas for the relaxation of international tension.

The authors of the book "Detente or Debacle. Common Sense in US-Soviet Relations" published in 1979--former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee W. Fulbright, American scientists and former ambassadors J. Galbraith and G. Kennan, former presidential aide for science and technology G. Kistiakowski, and congressman G. Aspin--insistently emphasize that detente must "accord fully with existing realities" and be free from extraordinary expectations.³⁰ In their opinion, detente should be developed taking into account the differences in the sociopolitical systems of the United States and the USSR, which presuppose competition in the most varied spheres, including in the struggle of ideas; but this does not mean that a refusal to protect the vitally important national interests of each of the sides, from which, however, it does not follow that there is a right to intervene in each other's internal affairs. And, finally, detente, as is stressed in the book, does not and cannot mean some kind of "awards system" for "good behavior" and by itself should not be the subject of "political trading." Despite all the attempts of Carter and his most zealous allies to cancel out what has been achieved and return the world to "cold war" times, the edifice of European detente built through the joint efforts of many states demonstrates stability. And the "hawks" across the ocean will not succeed in shaking it, in upsetting the military strategic balance between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism.

In the past years the Europeans have learned to cherish what detente has given them, namely the advantages of a peaceful life and economic, scientific and technical and cultural cooperation. Their value is particularly obvious against the background of the crises and flare-ups of tension that imperialism along with the Chinese hegemons has succeeded in causing in other parts of the world. The Europeans do not want tension to be brought across to their continent. In the West European countries there is an expansion and reinforcement of the movement that unites people with differing political views for defending detente, good-neighborly relations and the development of peaceful cooperation with their neighbors in the East. And among statesmen in the West there is a growing understanding of the need to continue the political dialog with the socialist countries and to seek jointly for solutions to existing problems. By no means all of them are prepared to sacrifice the achievements of detente by displaying heroic "loyalty of the Nibelungen" to the United States. Washington's attempt to achieve the virtual isolation of the Soviet Union has suffered obvious failure. The meeting between L.I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the President of France V. Giscard d'Estaing in Warsaw in May 1980, and also the talks between USSR and FRG leaders in Moscow in July of the same year promoted an improvement in the international climate. Of fundamental significance is the fact

that at the Moscow talks both sides stated that they consider the relaxation of tension essential, possible and useful, and they expressed their will to act in such a way that it becomes the leading trend in international relations. The political leaders of Finland and Austria have spoken out decisively in favor of maintaining detente as a leading trend. And sober-thinking circles inside the United States itself, who recognize the danger of nuclear war and the whole risk of "war brinkmanship" are also speaking out for the retention of detente. They are sharply criticizing the encouragement of force in U.S. foreign policy, the exacerbation of tension and the curtailment of Soviet-U.S. relations in various spheres. The American international specialist S. Hoffman writes: "The attempts by the United States to solve foreign policy problems by means of a new emphasis on military force are an underestimation of long-term problems and of little use." He stresses that "there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence." In his opinion, cooperation between the USSR and the United States is not only possible because of common interests, primarily in the sphere of preventing war, but also essential, since "the solution to many problems is impossible without at least minimal participation by the USSR."³¹

Speaking out against the "effect of emotional, party and even extremist political campaigns" on U.S. foreign policy, the eminent public figure G. McGovern recalls that the truly vitally important need for the United States is to avoid nuclear war with the Soviet Union.³²

Politicians and ideologists in the West who think realistically rightly see the advantages and benefits of detente in lightening the burden of arms, preventing and eliminating conflict shocks and resolving disputed questions by negotiation. In contrast to the United States and its NATO allies, the USSR and the other socialist countries offer the world not confrontation but cooperation, not "cold" or "hot" war but relaxation and peaceful coexistence, not increased hostility but mutual trust, not an arms race but disarmament. This has been, is and remains the strategic line of the coordinated foreign policy of the socialist countries, a policy that has been consistently pursued by them.

The CPSU Central Committee June (1980) Plenum expressed the conviction that objective opportunities and public-political forces exist capable of preventing the slide into a new "cold war," and of insuring normal, peaceful cooperation between states with different social systems. The CPSU Central Committee plenum resolution stresses that "the relaxation of tension has put down deep roots in present-day international life and there are realistic preconditions for maintaining it as the dominant trend in world politics."³³

The lessons of the seventies graphically prove that detente is the only route to stable peace. There is no other road. In order to make this road the highway for the development of international relations during the eighties it is essential to preserve everything positive that has been done in the past decade. In other words, it is a matter of insuring that the capital of the policy of detente--and it is quite large--is not put into a bank merely to be paid interest at the old rates. The fruits of detente must be multiplied.

A concrete, constructive program of actions to eliminate the threat of a renewal of the "cold war" and to relax international tension and move ahead in the matter of detente was formulated in the May (1980) declaration of the member states of the Warsaw Pact which spoke out decisively for maintaining the military balance that has been established and renouncing attempts to achieve superiority of force.

Under the conditions of the complication of the international situation at the start of the eighties, caused by the actions of imperialist forces and their arms buildup, the Soviet Union has again reaffirmed the exceptional importance of taking effective steps to reduce the danger of war, restrain the arms race, and effect disarmament among the other questions on the agenda of world politics. L.I. Brezhnev stresses that "no state or people now faces a more important task than that of preventing the imperialist policy of "from a position of strength" from supplanting detente and from preventing the flywheel of the arms race from gathering new and extremely dangerous speed."³⁴

The draft resolution "On Certain Urgent Measures To Reduce the Danger of War" introduced by the Soviet Union at the 35th UN General Assembly contains specific proposals whose realization could exert a restraining influence on the growing military threat and would promote a lowering of tension in interstate relations and slow down the arms race.

Another document presented for examination at the 35th UN General Assembly-- the Soviet Union's memorandum "For Peace and Disarmament, for the Guarantee of International Security"--recalls in summary form those proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the interests of achieving success in the struggle to reinforce the foundation of general peace and security.

The specific affairs of the Soviet Union at the moment of exacerbation of the international situation and the growing danger of war graphically prove the seriousness and responsibility with which our country approaches the solution of the cardinal problems of world politics and the maintaining and augmentation of the policy of detente. But, of course, the business of detente is the common affair of all peoples. All who hold dear the interests of peace should undertake unilateral, bilateral and multilateral weighty actions to maintain detente as the main direction in the development of international relations during the eighties.

The results of the November 1980 presidential election in the United States graphically prove the imperilment [komprometatsiya] in the eyes of Americans of the domestic and foreign policies of the J. Carter administration. Whether the new administration will draw from the lessons of the elections the necessary conclusion the near future will show.

The Soviet Union considers that given the mutual desire of the sides it is quite possible to improve Soviet-U.S. relations. In talks with Senator C. Percy on 26 November 1980, L.I. Brezhnev stated: "We have not wanted and do not want a deterioration in relations with the United States. Even less do we want thrown away everything positive that has been achieved earlier through joint efforts. The Soviet Union is a supporter of strengthening and developing relations with the United States on a long-term basis."³⁵ The improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations would give new impetus to the process of detente.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA 23 May 1980.
2. A. Belov, V. Petrov. "SSSR-SShA: perestroyka otnosheniy [The USSR and the USSR: A Restructuring of Relations], Moscow 1976; N.I. Levechev. "Novyy etap mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniy" [The New Stage in International Relations], Moscow 1976; Ibid. "Velikiy Okt'yabr' i perestroyka mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniy" [The Great October and the Restructuring of International Relations], Moscow 1978; A.O. Chubar'yan. "Mirovye sotsializmovaniye: teoriya i praktika" [Peaceful Coexistence: Theory and Practice], Moscow 1976; K.I. Zarodov. "Sotsializm, mir, revolyutsiya. Nekotorye voprosy teorii i praktiki mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniy i massovoy bor'by" [Socialism, Peace, Revolution. Some Questions of the Theory and Practice of International Relations and the Mass Struggle], Moscow 1977; Sh.P. Ganukoyev, N.I. Kapchenko. "O teorii vneshney politiki sotsializma" [On the Theory of the Foreign Policy of Socialism], Moscow 1977, and "Sotsializm i yevropeyskaya bezopasnosti" [Socialism and European Security], Moscow 1977.
3. FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 4 November 1971.
4. It is extremely indicative that of the almost 100 treaties and agreements concluded by the USSR since it established diplomatic relations with the United States in 1933, about half were concluded during the period 1972-1976. A. Belov, V. Petrov. op. cit. p 19.
5. "For Peace in the World. The 15-18 June 1979 Vienna Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting. Documents, speeches and materials" Moscow 1979.
6. Department of State Bulletin, May 1975.
7. Department of State Bulletin, August 1975.
8. See: "Sovetskaya vneshnaya politika i yevropeyskaya bezopasnosti" [Soviet Foreign Policy and European Security], Moscow 1972; Yu.N. Rakhmaninov, G.V. Uranov. "Yevropa: bezopasnosti i sotrudnichestvo" [Europe: Security and Cooperation], Moscow 1974; "Problemy sovremennoy Yevropy. Yevropeyskaya bezopasnosti i tendentsiya razvitiya v Zapadnoy Yevrope" [Problems of Europe Today. European Security and Trends in Developments in West Europe], Moscow 1974; "Yevropeyskaya bezopasnosti i sotrudnichestvo: predposylki, problemy, perspektivy" [European Security and Cooperation: Prerequisites, Problems, Prospects], Moscow 1976; "Mezhdunarodno-pravovye formy sotrudnichestva gosudarstv v Yevrope" [International Law Forms of Cooperation between the States of Europe], Moscow 1977; Yu.N. Rakhmaninov. "Problema yevropeyskoy bezopasnosti" [The Problem of European Security], Moscow 1979; Yu.B. Kashlev. "Razryadka v Yevrope. Ot Khel'sinki k Madridu" [Detente in Europe. From Helsinki to Madrid], Moscow 1980.
9. "Vo imya mira, bezopasnosti i sotrudnichestva. K itogam Soveshchaniya po bezopasnosti i sotrudnichestvo v Yevrope, sostoyavshegosya v Khel'sinki 30 iyulya-1 avgusta 1975 g." [For Peace, Security and Cooperation. On the Results of the 30 July-1 August 1975 Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe], Moscow 1975, pp 17-23.

10. A.A. Gromyko. "Vo imya torzhestva leninskoy vneshney politiki" [For the Triumph of Leninist Foreign Policy], Moscow 1978, p 417.
11. "Ot Khel'sinki do Belgrada. Sovetskiy Sotuz i osushchestvleniye Zaklyuchitel'nogo Akta obshcheyevropeyskogo soveshchaniya. Dokumenty i materialy." [From Helsinki to Belgrade. The Soviet Union and the Implementation of the Final Act of the All-European Conference. Documents and materials], Moscow 1977, pp 15-16.
12. PRAVDA 30 Jul 1980.
13. ZA RUBEZHON No 31, 1980, p 8.
14. UN Document, Res. /A/32/155.
15. UN Document, Res. /A/8 -10/2
16. Signed 11 February 1971, entered into force 18 May 1972. More than 60 states are treaty participants.
17. Signed 10 April 1972, entered into force 26 March 1975. About 80 states are participants.
18. Signed 18 May 1977.
19. L.I. Brezhnev. "Along the Leninist Course." Speeches and Articles. Vol. 4, Moscow, 1972, p 384
20. PRAVDA 5 October 1976.
21. The New York Times. 30 March 1980.
22. A.G. Arbatov. "Bezopasnosti v yadernyy vek i politika Vashingtona" [Security in the Nuclear Age and Washington's Policy], Moscow 1980, p 266.
23. The New York Times 6,7,8 and 14 August 1980; Washington Post 6 and 14 August 1980; The Christian Science Monitor 11 August 1980.
24. Foreign Affairs, Fall 1980 p 102.
25. As UN Secretary General R. Waldheim noted in his report to the 35th UN General Assembly, "the strategy of disarmament adopted by the special session (of the UN General Assembly in May 1978), which could become a milestone on the road to reducing the burden of arms, has still not been embodied in actual actions and instead there has been a further escalation of the arms race.... Expenditure on arms in the world in 1980 will exceed the stunning figure of \$500 billion." (Report of the UN Secretary General on the Work of the Organization. UN Document A/35/1. 10 September 1980 p 16).

26. A.S. Todorov, "Politicheskoto razvedryavane i ideologicheskata borba"
[Political Intelligence and the Ideological Struggle], Sofia 1979 p 108.
27. Detente. Edited by G.R. Urban. New York 1979.
28. Time 24 June 1980.
29. A.S. Todorov op. cit.
30. Detente or Debauch. Common Sense in US-Soviet Relations. New York 1979.
31. The New York Review of Books, 1980, Vol 27 No 3 pp 18-24.
32. Foreign Policy Summer 1980.
33. PRAVDA 24 June 1980.
34. PRAVDA 30 August 1980.
35. PRAVDA 27 November 1980.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya", 1981.

9642

CSO: 1807

INTERNATIONAL

U.S. SUPPORT FOR LATIN AMERICAN DICTATORS ATTACKED

Moscow NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW in English 8 Jan 81 pp 1-3

[Article by Vladislav Chirkov: "U.S. Support for Latin American Dictators Attacked"]

[Text] I want to cite several of the latest reports from the countries of Latin America ruled by dictatorial regimes.

In El Salvador, Enrique Alvarez Cordova, chairman of the Revolutionary-Democratic Front, and five other leaders of the Front, were murdered. Pinochet's agents assassinated one of the leaders of the United Trade Union Centre of Working People of Chile, Juan Olivares Perez who was arrested together with his comrades at Santiago's centre.

In Uruguay, the reactionary military have been nurturing plans for the elimination of the leaders of the democratic movement who are pining away behind bars in dungeons.

In Haiti, more than 50 members of the opposition and journalists have been arrested.

The dictatorial Latin American regimes are only holding on thanks to the U.S. backing. Going on with its "human rights" game, the American administration does no more with respect to these regimes than reprove or sometimes shake its finger at a certain dictator or threaten to withhold a loan (so that to grant him eventually even more money than was promised before).

It is a matter of common knowledge how many million dollars, when and in what way the American Central Intelligence Agency spent in order to "destabilize" the Popular Unity government in Chile and create conditions conducive to the military-fascist putsch in that country.

It is crystal clear that Paraguay's Dictator Stroessner would not have held on for over a quarter of a century now if not for backing from the United States.

The Pentagon is generously supplying the Uruguayan military junta with weapons, ammunition, police equipment and even instruments of torture.

Imperialist circles are giving wide assistance to the reactionary Salvadoran junta which is waging a war aimed at exterminating its own people. According to the American press, the U.S. has granted the junta military aid to the tune of

100 million dollars. The Pentagon has trained hundreds of Salvadoran cutthroats in the Panama Canal zone. At least 200 American military "advisers" are taking part in punitive operations against peasants who support rebels.

Western reactionary circles are escalating their feverish activities in El Salvador, fearing another Nicaragua. Imperialism was just a step short of a shock as a result of the revolution in Nicaragua which toppled Somoza. For the time being, however, Western leaders have recovered from nervousness and come up with a new tactic of a sort of "division of labour": on the outside Washington is maintaining correct relations with the Nicaraguan regime, while secret services are plotting against it. In Guatemala and Honduras hundreds of former "Somoza guardsmen" are being trained for invasion into Nicaragua, and the late Somoza's brother has arrived in Costa Rica with a false passport.

Why does the United States prefer military-dictatorial regimes to bourgeois-democratic ones? Generals, having fallen greedily upon power, can hold it only with Washington's support. Washington actually helps them both militarily and financially. But it is necessary to pay for such services because imperialists never give anything without compensation. So the dictators pay with the national wealth of their countries. To cite just one example, Stroessner has given American companies concessions for half of Paraguay's territory. The foreign monopolies have reserved for themselves the right to give the Paraguayans a mere 11 percent of the oil these monopolies extract. Let us analyze the home policies of the dictatorial regimes.

Having seized power, brasshats usually proclaim ridding the country of the "communist danger" to be their top-priority task. In fact, they first of all launch repression against Communists. At the same time, the struggle against "communism" is used as a pretext for mounting terror against all democratic forces, against all those who fight for freedom, for ridding their homeland of the sway of the oligarchy and foreign, mainly U.S., monopolies.

But the dictators have to propose something positive. So they begin to lavish demagogical promises to ensure "progress, prosperity and well-being for all." Shortly afterwards all these promises prove to be pure phrasemongering.

Let us take the Chilean junta with its seven-year experience of the struggle for "prosperity". And what are the results? At the seminar on the problems of Latin America, held in Chicago last autumn with the participation of representatives of different U.S. public organizations, it was stressed that the policy pursued by the military-fascist junta had put Chile on the brink of an economic collapse. The situation of the working people has been deteriorating with each passing year. The prices have been skyrocketing, the unemployment rate is about 30 percent.

At the same time, there is a continuous growth in the spending on the army and armament--the junta's military budget for 1981 is to reach 128 million dollars. The profits of the foreign monopolies also increase.

In Uruguay too the ruling junta's activities have resulted in a deep economic crisis. The country's foreign-trade deficit stands at 40 percent and the foreign debt amounts to 1.7 billion dollars. It is a huge sum for the country with a population of a mere 2.5 million. Since 1973 when the brasshats seized power, the real wages have dropped by nearly 50 percent. Escaping the persecutions and poverty, 600,000 Uruguayans--nearly a quarter of the population--have left the country.

"Baby Doc"--Jean-Claude Duvalier, dictator of Haiti, cannot boast any successes in his economic "activities" either. Haiti is one of the least developed countries in the world. Sixty percent of its able-bodied population are jobless. Average annual per capita income in the towns is 80 dollars, and in the countryside--20 dollars. Twenty percent of all new-born children die in the first days of their life.

Dictators like to address people with lavish promises, but these promises are as distant from reality as the stars are from the earth--the earth in which they want to bury thousands of fighters for justice. But new freedom fighters replace those killed in the battle.

A graphic illustration of this are the current developments in El Salvador. The whole people is rising against the oligarchy. On the call of the country's revolutionary organisations the Salvadoran patriots have declared their preparedness to launch a general onslaught against the anti-popular junta in the next few days.

CSO: 1812

INTERNATIONAL

WEST'S PROPAGANDA EFFORTS AGAINST USSR CONDEMNED

Moscow NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW in English 8 Jan 81 pp 1-3

[Article by V.N. Ivanov, doctor of philosophy, assistant director of the Institute of Sociological Studies, Academy of Sciences of the USSR]

[Text] In recent years the more reactionary forces of imperialism have noticeably stepped up their activity in the field of ideological struggle. To achieve their aims, i.e. to undermine detente, to destroy the spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation in the relations between states, imperialist propaganda is striving to shift from isolated subversive acts to the organization of a wide front of "psychological warfare" against socialism.

Here are a few figures that give an idea of the scale of these efforts: today there are 40 radio stations with 130 transmitters beaming their broadcasts to the USSR in 23 languages and the simultaneous duration of these "radio voices" is about 270 hours a day. If we recall that in 1947 only two stations, the British BBC and the Voice of America beamed broadcasts to this country, it will be clear how much is being staked on this type of ideological struggle.

Let us take a closer look at the mechanism of one of the more large-scale ideological subversions of recent times. In 1975, immediately after the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe held in Helsinki, the numerous "radio voices" started their noisy and well-coordinated campaign aimed, in the first place, at convincing the world public of the undemocratic nature of the Soviet system and, in the second place, at spreading doubts in the political ideals and values of socialism amid Soviet citizens. To do this, it was necessary to have proof that there were malcontents and persecuted individuals in socialist society and that, allegedly, there was a struggle of political forces going on in the USSR.

It is natural that a handful of turncoats who boastfully termed themselves "the champions of justice" should become the center of attention of Western propaganda. Their slanderous fabrications about "the persecution" in the USSR of believers, of criminal punishment for people "who think differently," of placing "dissidents" into psychiatric hospitals, of the "russification" of the national republics and so on are being assiduously blown up and spread by all the means of mass media. It is not without the help of the secret services, the CIA above all, that attempts are being made to set up the so-called groups to monitor Soviet compliance with the Helsinki agreements.

The propagandist "sound effects" are maintained with the help of different "press conferences" with anti-Soviets who have settled abroad. Their unabashed lying is immediately put on the air. Attempts are being made to interfere into the domestic affairs of this country under the flag of the defense of "human rights".

Who is standing at the helm of ideological subversion? The immediate organizers of this activity are the secret services of the imperialist states, the CIA in the first place. It is precisely the CIA that directs the activities not only of its structural units--Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe but also of the government radio station Voice of America. This was demonstrated with special clarity in the coverage of events in Afghanistan and attempts to hush up the success of the Olympic Games in Moscow when both their stands and methods of presenting the material wholly coincided.

However, there are far more powerful forces backing the CIA and other imperialist secret services. These are the international corporations, the multinational concerns of the military-industrial complex and the NATO generals who are supported by Right-wing and ultra Right-wing political organizations. It is their financial support and man-hating doctrines that nourish the secret service system and the network of "research" establishments like the International "Samizdat" Study Centre in Munich which supervizes the fabrication, collection and distribution of pasquinades on the socialist way of life. It is with their sanctioning and subsidies that scores of U.S. and Canadian universities are training future experts on ideological subversion, and it is also thanks to their efforts that the Voice of America's budget was 83 million dollars last year and is expected to increase by almost one-third this year.

Now a few words about "strengthening spiritual contacts among nations." It is one of the falsest theses of bourgeois propaganda. The authors of the anti-communist book of articles titled "Marxism in the Modern World" which has come out in the USA, openly declare that nationalism is one of the most powerful emotional forces of our century. The theorists of bourgeois propaganda are not to be outdone either. As early as 1971 Z. Brzezinski wrote in a collection of articles called "Soviet National Problems" of the need to expand radio propaganda for the different nationalities inhabiting the USSR. How is this being put into practice by the radio voices? Let us take, for instance, the question of "russification"--one of the main questions that is stressed in Western radio programmes beamed to Central Asia. In different ways these broadcasts try to persuade the people that the policy of the CPSU is allegedly aimed at "doing away" with the ancient cultures and traditions of the Uzbeks, Tajiks and Turkmens and "wholly russifying" them. Realizing the futility of attempts to convince their potential listeners of the "backwardness" of the Soviet East, the Western "voices" are always ready to give their own explanation for the tremendous progress made by the nations that had once been living in the backward provinces of the tsarist empire. More than once, Radio Liberty, in its Uzbek-language programmes, has repeated the fabrications of the American Sovietologist, Richard Pierce, who said that Central Asia could have achieved the same success without the Soviet system since the whole world was advancing and progress was not connected with any particular political system.

As for Russian culture, the "voices" are actively propagating the idealistic and other conservative trends in the Russian political and literary thought of the past. The bosses of ideological subversion are trying to implant the theses of the

specific national character of the Russians, of the inexplicable "Slavic soul" which has a natural affinity for the ideas of Bakunin and Kropotkin. All these efforts are aimed at depicting Marxism as a phenomenon alien to the "Russian Slavic nature", a phenomenon that has been brought in from outside. There is no need to explain who organizes these broadcasts and guides them ideologically.

The General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States Gus Hall once said that the most repulsive consequences of imperialist ideology were similar to those of the majority of harmful chemical substances that pollute our air and food. They bring evil though they themselves remain invisible. It is the same with ideological subversion--it injects poison into people's minds almost unnoticeably.

That is why the 20th session of the UNESCO General Conference recently unanimously adopted (with the representatives of 146 countries voting for) the declaration of the main principles that deal with the contribution of the mass media to "strengthening peace and international understanding, the promotion of human rights and to countering racism and apartheid and incitements to war." The idea of drawing up the document was advanced by the USSR several years ago and it is quite natural that the Soviet Union was the country to do it.

CSO: 1812

INTERNATIONAL

U.S. BACKING FOR 'REACTIONARY' CENTRAL AMERICAN REGIMES ATTACKED

Moscow NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW in English 27 Jan 81 pp 1-3

[Article by A. Kolos]

[Text] This region of the American continent, the home of several relatively small states in area and population, has recently been a scene of turbulent events. In a number of countries the patriotic forces, using various methods of political struggle, have had to resort to armed action. Following the victory of the revolution in Nicaragua, the flame of another one has flared up in El Salvador where several departments have been brought under control of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front after a series of successful offensive operations. The mass of people of these countries are fighting for genuine sovereignty and for the right to decide their own destinies and for all that goes under the capacious concept of freedom and independence.

In the course of this struggle, the progressive forces of these countries are having to deal with a united front of the forces of home and foreign reaction, and, above all, U.S. imperialism which has proclaimed Central America a sphere of its "vital interests" and is trying to keep it under its political, economic and military control.

All kinds of means, up to and including ruthless terror and physical destruction of patriots, are being used to preserve the outdated social relations. In Guatemala, repressive agencies have killed over twenty thousand people for political reasons since 1954 when the CIA-backed reactionary militarists brought down the legally elected Arbenz government. Now, in an effort to keep in being the reactionary regime in El Salvador, Washington has decided to increase its military aid to it by around ten million dollars. It is not sheer chance that reprisals in El Salvador were drastically intensified after the arrival of American "anti-guerrilla warfare specialists." Last year alone they, together with their henchmen from extreme rightist groups and military circles, wiped out more than ten thousand people.

Reprisals against patriots are under way in Honduras, neighbouring on El Salvador. Recently a Washington-recommended "amnesty" was announced there for such criminal elements as Major Enrique Chinchilla, the ring-leader of a criminal organisation which acted against peasant activists, progressive-minded intellectuals and students. There has been, besides, a reshuffle in the top officer corps of the armed forces. The idea behind it has been unequivocally defined by Colonel Alvarez, the new chief of the security forces. He linked his appointment directly with the need to start

an "open fight against the left groups operating in Honduras". Since then, the units of the Fourth Infantry Battalion have been thrown into action to suppress the strike of working people from the Isletas Peasant Association, while other army units have been reported by foreign press to be used in fighting Salvadoran patriots.

The facts show that imperialist circles continue to bank on force and extreme reaction. At the same time, ever greater attention in the plans of imperialism is paid to carrying out a number of structural changes and ensuring at least the minimal stability of reactionary regimes.

A feverish search is also going on for political figures who have not discredited themselves by open involvement in genocide and other crimes, people capable of actually implementing the old policy by new methods. These tactics, as can be seen from foreign press reports, are also being applied in El Salvador.

According to a NEW YORK TIMES correspondent's report, J. Cienfuegos, a member of the command of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, has expressed the opinion of the patriotic forces: "The junta is facing such internal problems that it cannot maintain itself in power. We are confident that we shall win an ultimate victory."

Washington has launched a great activity around Guatemala's former Vice-President F. Kramer, who has fled the country and refused to return to it as a sign of protest, so he says, against the repressive policy pursued by the government of General Garcia. In the opinion of informed observers, certain U.S. circles are trying to create in Guatemala or abroad a new political organisation led by F. Kramer which would be able to replace the existing government or play the role of the "reserve variant" in the event of a complete collapse of the Guatemalan dictatorship.

Through financial organisations like the Inter-American Development Bank the United States is attempting to reinforce the social base of reactionary regimes. Thus, money continues to be allocated to Guatemala and Honduras for the purpose of establishing peasant associations financially dependent on the government.

The hypocrisy of Washington has strikingly shown itself in the matter of granting a 75 million-dollar loan to Nicaragua. The USA tried to play into the hands of right-wing forces and exert pressure on the government of Nicaragua to make concessions and changes in the policy of the country. But the imperialist circles failed to carry out their plan.

Over the recent period the government of Nicaragua has strengthened its economic positions. It has got a new agreement with a group of foreign banks, including American, on the deferment of payments, received fairly significant foreign-exchange earnings from the sale of coffee, sesame, cotton and so on.

It should be noted that Washington's subversive activity is not limited to Nicaragua and El Salvador. Thus, American multinational corporations, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency seek to provoke a political crisis in Costa Rica and are instigating local reactionaries to an open action to seize power and establish an extremist right-wing dictatorship.

Washington has chosen a tactic of procrastination and undisguised sabotage in the implementation of the earlier-signed agreements with Panama. Infringing on the sovereignty and national dignity of the Panamanians, Washington continues its policy of blackmail and pressure and its attempts to retain complete control over the Panama Canal, which rightfully belongs to the people of that country.

It is obvious that the manoeuvres of imperialism are aimed at retarding in every way the advancement of the peoples of Central America along the road to full and final liberation. And today, at the new stage of the struggle, unity and solidarity of all the democratic and patriotic forces, of all who cherish the national interests of their peoples, independence and progress are as necessary as before.

CSO: 1812

INTERNATIONAL

UZBEKISTAN'S CONTACTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES DESCRIBED

Tashkent OZBEKISTAN MADANIYATI in Uzbek 3 Feb 81 p 4

[Article by Sur'at Miqasimov, vice-chairman of the presidium of the Uzbekistan Society for Friendly and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries: "The Struggle for Peace Goes On"]

[Text] Among the important issues facing us at the present time are the noble tasks of improving international relations, reducing tensions and strengthening friendship among peoples, security, good neighborliness and peace on earth.

The Soviet people are actively working to carry out the peace program advanced by party congresses. This is a brilliant result of the great efforts being made by the Central Committee of the CPSU and of its politburo headed by L.I. Brezhnev.

The Soviet Union has always considered cultural relations as an important factor in preserving peace among countries with different social and economic systems.

The Uzbekistan Society for Friendly and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries also has a share in establishing internationalist relations among foreign countries and peoples. Our society, which is a mass, voluntary organization that plays a major role in expanding and strengthening friendly and cultural relations between our republic and foreign countries, has drawn in all levels of the working class. We are closely acquainting our foreign friends with the economy, way of life, science and culture of our republic and at the same time finding out about their way of life as well.

The Uzbekistan Society for Friendly and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries relies in its activities on activists organized in 34 chapters for the republic, oblasts and cities. Thus our local units function in a number of plants and factories, kolkhoz and sovkhoz and scientific and cultural office collectives. Our chapters are working particularly well in the oblasts of Andizhan, Fergana, Bukhara, Samarkand and Khorezm. Members of the working class, of kolkhozes and the intelligentsia are working actively in them.

Many members of collectives have been awarded decorations "for contributions towards promoting friendship" and honored with commendations of the USSR Friendship Society, the Soviet Woman's Committee and of societies for foreign friendship for their active participation in the struggle for peace and in strengthening friendship among peoples.

Interest in our republic is growing. At the present time we are sending various books, photographs, albums, works of fine art, examples of Uzbek children's art, badges and post cards that acquaint people with life in our republic to more than 6000 addressees in 120 countries at the requests of our foreign friends. The illustrated monthly bulletin SAVET OZBEKISTANI, published by the Uzbekistan Society for Friendly and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, is distributed with a yearly circulation of 200,000 to various countries of the world in Uzbek, Russian, English, Persian, Arabic, Spanish, German and Urdu. Published in its pages are articles by famous government and social figures, leading workers and kolkhoz members and scientific and cultural workers. This colorful bulletin is increasingly drawing the attention of the foreign public and the demand for it is growing.

Prof Jahan Nath Azad, the aged Indian writer, poet and critic and chairman of the Jammu Progressive Writers' Association, has written as follows in a letter to us: "I read each new issue of the magazine with great interest and later turn it over to members of my association. SAVET OZBEKISTANI is a mirror that shows us your republic and successes achieved in the areas of literature, art, education, science, sports, production and technology."

Information is given in the magazine also on Soviet Union days celebrated in foreign countries, measures connected with Uzbekistan in particular. In just the last few years such festivities have been held in Iraq, Belgium, Switzerland, Laos, India, Italy, the United States, Afghanistan, France, the Congo, Algeria, Finland, Norway and Mali and were well received by the peoples of those countries. The ministries, public organizations and creative units of Uzbekistan have done a great deal in the celebration of such festivities.

Our activists in various professions have gone to more than 30 countries of the world during the period of the 10th Five-Year-Plan. Friendship evenings, festive gatherings, meetings, exhibits, film festivals and days of culture held in our republic have further intensified our people's interest in learning about the life and culture of other peoples. Last year days of culture were held in Uzbekistan for Finland and Spain. A large photo-exhibit called "A Look at the Federal Republic of Germany" was put on display.

During the years 1976-1980 more than 12,000 foreigners from 60 countries came to Uzbekistan, acquainted themselves closely with our culture and art, had their breaths taken away by our cultural monuments and gushed about our beautiful Tashkent and our hospitable people. Here is what some said. The Indian teacher Alauddin Azad stated that: "The people of Tashkent, who received the guests from foreign countries with open arms and hospitality, took our breath away. The beautiful and clean streets, the eyes full of joy were unforgettable. Tashkent may also be considered truly worthy of being called the city of peace, comradeship and hospitality. When one views the results of its honorable labor one cannot but wish such a life for one's own people. I desire, above all, a country of friendship and brotherliness of one man for the other in which things are put to work for the people. I rejoice greatly at the fatherly care being lavished by the party and the government on the education of the younger generation."

Rene Lannua, president of the Belgium-USSR Friendship Association, has written: "I am well informed of Lenin's views of the nationalities question. Thus I am joyful to see how they are being put into practice in the case of Uzbekistan." Nisam Rifat Hashem, professor at Amman University and vice president of the Jordan-USSR Society, has stated that: "We are happy that it has been possible for us to acquaint ourselves with the economic and cultural achievements of Uzbekistan. The development of your republic is a worthy example for eastern peoples." The Japanese ballet master Masakida Komaki has written: "We are happy to have become acquainted with the multi-faceted culture and science of your republic. I am very impressed that various national traditions of the ballet art, which has existed for such a short time in Uzbekistan, have developed to such a degree."

Many other examples of this sort could be given.

The Uzbekistan Society for Friendly and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and its activists have always been active participants in major international measures carried out in Uzbekistan. Festivities such as Asian, African and Latin American film festivals, cultural and book fortnights for socialist countries, international student festivals, friendship weeks for the young people of various countries, international festivals of theater and music collectives, scientific forums, symposiums, seminars and workshops carried out in Tashkent have become traditions.

All are proof of the great contributions of our people and the activists of our society in the development of cultural relations with foreign countries.

Our fundamental goal is the building of a communist society. We are moving in that direction with conviction. We have passed another milestone on the way. The 10th Five-Year-Plan has been brought to a successful conclusion. These days the workers of the land of the Soviets are discussing the new five-year-plan proposal with great enthusiasm. When we study this proposal we realize that very important questions such as human happiness, human interest, peace on earth and the strengthening of friendship between peoples are fundamental to it. The Uzbekistan Society for Friendly and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries has done much in this area and will continue to do much in the future. The years of the new five-year-plan will be, once again, years of great victories, years of peace and years of brotherhood.

11433
CSO: 1810

REGIONAL

HISTORY, PROSPECTS OF GEORGIAN NATIONAL QUESTION DISCUSSED

Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian 23 Dec 80 p 2

(Article by Georgian Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member Leo Gorgiladze under rubric "Questions of Theory": "On the History of the National Question in Georgia")

[Text] The national question is one of the basic social problems. The present and future of the life of the peoples largely depend on its correct interpretation and just resolution.

The present epoch has brought the national question to the forefront and made it prominent. As Lenin remarked, it is again "in center stage of the political drama" of the developed capitalist countries. A world revolutionary process is unfolding through internationalist-revolutionary action. A commonwealth of countries of the socialist system has come into being as a natural consequence. National-liberation revolutions have enveloped the developing countries. Life itself has affirmed Engels' well-known dictum: an internationalist movement of the proletariat is possible only among independent nations, national independence is the basis of internationalist cooperation.

The working class cannot be indifferent to the fate of its country, its homeland. It is formed, lives, and struggles for renewal within the framework of the nation. Marx pointed out that the working class must become unified and strong in its own country, that the immediate arena of the struggle is its own country.

A nation is a form of social development. It plays a progressive role in the life of society. But any country is placed economically and politically within the framework of a state. Marx stated: "Every nation can and must learn from other nations." Scientific-technical progress has stepped up the internationalization of social life and enhanced the international, internationalist significance of the workers' movement.

The science of Marxism-Leninism views the place and role of the national question in social life "from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat's class struggle for the sake of the development of all society and socialism" (Lenin). Marxism-Leninism elucidated the theory of the national question, and socialist practice has affirmed its correctness.

In our multinational country, the national question has been resolved completely in terms of what we inherited from the prerevolutionary past. The peoples of the Soviet

Union have gained de jure and de facto equality, socialist nations have formed and developed and experienced flowering and rapprochement, friendship of peoples has been established, the nations' social-political and ideological unity has been strengthened, and a Soviet people has come into being as a new, historical community. As a result of all this, the national question has been fully and completely resolved in this country. Today the national question is no longer a problem, and its former concepts and categories are now a thing of the past here.

Under developed socialism, it has been replaced by the problem of national relations, which involves relations between nations and intranational relations in the material and spiritual life of society. The national question has been resolved, but nations do remain and the problem of national relations retains its viability. "National relations are a reality in a socialist society as well, always developing, giving rise to new problems and tasks" (L. I. Brezhnev).

The Soviet Union is a multinational state structured on the principle of socialist federalism. This gives rise to objective problems such as, for example, "finding the best path of development of the individual nations and nationalities and best reconciling the interests of each of them with the shared interests of the Soviet people as a whole" (L. I. Brezhnev). The communist formation has given rise to a new type of nations and a new form of national relations. The formation of socialist nations has given rise to socialist national relations and imposed logical development on the dual process of the nations' development and rapprochement. The party places great emphasis on a correct interpretation of the laws governing national relations and timely action accordingly.

Nor does the party forget that national prejudices and nationalist vestiges are still alive in the mentality of politically immature persons and are being incited and encouraged by the bourgeois world.

The present ideological struggle also encompasses the national question. The forces of anticommunism are attempting to falsify and discredit the Marxist-Leninist view of the national question. They do not all have the same understanding of the national question. Some preach nationalism, others preach cosmopolitanism. Certain ones deny the social-economic content of nation and reduce it to a spiritual, psychical-emotional entity; others assign a definite role to the ethnic factor and substitute an ethnic division of society for social-class division. The forces of anticommunism declare that the terms internationalist and national are mutually exclusive and claim that internationalization and the formation of an internationalist community of peoples constitute "denationalization."

Lenin created the party's national theory and program. The party's theoretical thinking and L. I. Brezhnev's works have enriched this theory with new postulates and conclusions under developed socialism. These have made more specific the Leninist concept of national development and rapprochement, elucidated the problems of national relations, and formulated a theory of the Soviet people, as embodied in the party's national policy and practice.

A clear and characteristic example of this is the OCP's and working people's activities in the field of national relations under developed socialism. The OCP is making creative use of Lenin's theoretical heritage, which requires "flexible and resourceful working out of particular tactics," taking account of the dialectics of the internationalist and the national, the general and the particular.

The historic decrees of the CPSU CC regarding the work of the Georgian party organization and the republic's economic development mapped out a specific social-national program of action for Georgia's working people, which is now playing a vital role in the internationalist-patriotic indoctrination of the working people.

Materials of the October 1976 All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference in Tbilisi, and E. Shevardnadze's report to the conference, "Current Questions of Implementation of the Leninist National Policy and Internationalist Indoctrination in Accordance with the Decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress," have served as a textbook.

GCP documents and materials present a profound elucidation of current problems of implementing the Leninist national policy and internationalist indoctrination. They are making an important contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory and practice with regard to nations and national relations.

Eduard Shevardnadze's well-known article "The CPSU's National Policy in the Period of Developed Socialism," which was recently published in the theoretical and information journal of the international communist movement *PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA*, elucidates the theoretical problems of nations and national relations under developed socialism and presents a new view of the particularities of the history of resolution of the national question in Georgia "by which local experience and local specifics enrich the treasure of the CPSU's experience."

On the example of our republic, the GCP has elucidated the problem of reconciling the national and the internationalist and clarified their dialectics, which rejects identification or opposition between the national and the internationalist and points up their unity.

Lenin discovered the two historical tendencies in the national question that constitute the global governing principle of the establishment and development of socialism with regard to nations and national relations. "Both tendencies--the flowering and rapprochement of nations--are objective in character. We can recognize and consequently direct them. But no one can abolish them" (E. A. Shevardnadze).

Developed socialism has created a qualitatively new, higher form of human intercourse and relations. A historic community, the Soviet people, has come into being. It has some of the traits of a nation, yet it is not national but inter-national, an internationalist community in which the nations' development proceeds via the nations' rapprochement, while rapprochement proceeds via the nations' development, both in the material and the spiritual sphere.

Economic and social-class integration unfolds an ideological-political and moral-psychological community. National consciousness develops and plays an increasing role in the life of the nation. Engels pointed out: Truly national ideas are truly internationalist ideas. Socialist national consciousness preserves the national characteristics which distinguish nations, and acquires internationalist, communist traits which unite nations. There is full unity between the truly internationalist and the truly national, the national is internationalist, the internationalist is national. This postulate has been given a new, different slant in our theoretical Marxist literature by E. Shevardnadze: "It is in our time that, for the first time in the history of mankind, national energy has become a true internationalist force."

One manifestation of the dual process of national development and rapprochement is "the polyphony of languages and tongues." The social functions of the national languages is growing. Under conditions of the friendship of peoples, equal rights of the national languages, and mutual enrichment, a positive, unitary, and objectively necessary process of development of the national languages and of Russian, the language of communication between nations, is taking place.

In a socialist nation, unlike a bourgeois nation, there are not two nations or two cultures. It is socially homogeneous, and its culture is solely socialist-internationalist in content. The dialectics of national in form, internationalist in content can be expressed as follows in Lenin's words: "The form is essential, the essence is formed," and the Soviet people's unitary socialist culture comprises "an organic fusion of the spiritual values created by each people" (L. I. Brezhnev).

Proletarian internationalism is an expression of the world view of the working class with regard to the national question. Under developed socialism it has become the theory and practice of socialist internationalism. Socialist internationalism is not unnational. The existence of nations, independence in internal affairs, internationalist alliance, and organic reconciliation of the internationalist "is part of the very term internationalism" (Engels).

Under developed socialism we have yet to fully overcome the contradiction between our heritage of socialist internationalism and the nationalistic relapses that still persist in the mentality and behavior of a few narrow-minded individuals. Vestiges of capitalism are especially persistent in regard to national relations, for they are cloaked in national raiment. The struggle against them is a vital part of the general struggle to achieve a healthy moral and psychological climate.

In its struggle for the guiding motto--"For Man and Man's Personality"--the GCP has elucidated the current theoretical problems of transforming man's spiritual world. In his interview with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA (21 September 1980), E. Shevardnadze defined the term "moral-psychological climate" and spelled out its basic components. He discussed the matter of reasonable requirements and spelled out their criteria, and defined the role and significance of a healthy moral-psychological climate in overcoming the petit-bourgeois, consumer mentality, making moral choices, and developing an active social stance, in surmounting national egotism and provincialism, and enhancing national pride.

One of our main tasks is the patriotic and internationalist indoctrination of the working people. It comprises the unity of theoretical concepts and practical-creative activities aimed at instilling "in every Soviet citizen a sense of pride in the socialist homeland and unshakable, fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR, respect for national values and national cultures, and intolerance toward any manifestation of nationalism; fostering further strengthening of the unity and alliance of the great Soviet people" (from the 26 April 1979 CPSU CC decree: "Further Improvement of Ideological and Political-Indoctrination Work").

The GCP's theoretical thinking has reviewed the history of resolution of the national question here and determined the tendency of its development and the particular direction of its unique input to the general mainstream. It has placed the question of nation and national relations in a historical context not only in order to correctly explain the Georgian nation's past and future but also, most

assuredly, to penetrate the present and "fearlessly perceive the future and the bold practical efforts needed to realize it" (Lenin).

The formation of nations and the development of national relations gave rise to the national question and laid down the general path of the struggle for a positive resolution of it, which every country has had to travel in its own way. The Georgian people have their own history of the origin, establishment, and resolution of the national question. E. Shevardnadze has reviewed the problem of the particular history of the national question in Georgia and given us a general outline of its Marxist-Leninist interpretation.

Union with Russia marked a new era in Georgia's history. It became a component part of a multinational state. Georgian historical scholarship used to characterize this important historical event as progressive and called it "the lesser evil." But life made it clear that the term "lesser evil" did not accurately reflect the historical significance of the union, and it was rejected. "Evil is evil, be it large or small."

Georgia's union with Russia was given a new interpretation. Georgian historiography was enriched with new concepts, new postulates and conclusions. It was shown that the significance of Georgia's union with Russia was defined not by the uniting of dynasties, which undoubtedly gave grounds for the introduction of the term "lesser evil," but--and this is the main point--by the "uniting of the democratic segments of the Russian and Georgian peoples, their emergence together in the arena of history, the joining of forces of the Russian and Georgian people in the coming class struggle to bury the exploiting classes. This is the true meaning of the history of our homeland" ("Questions of Internationalist Indoctrination of the Working People," a collection, 1979).

When history presented the Georgian people with the choice, they chose Russia and joined their fate to hers. History has affirmed the correctness of this choice. Union with Russia brought peace to our land, Georgia was saved from physical and spiritual annihilation and brought into the mainstream of world civilization.

In turn, Georgia repaid the debt. The Georgian people have made a worthy contribution to the commonwealth of peoples, to the mutual enrichment of cultures. "Our people have always stood side by side with Great Russia both in times of severe trial and in times of triumph. This tendency has become a firm law of our life" (E. A. Shevardnadze).

To reject the expression "lesser evil" by no means entails denying the significance of the national-liberation movement. It denies justification of the Georgian nobility's separation rather than the national-liberation movement. It acknowledges that the union provided the national-democratic struggle with broad scope and made it a tributary to the general democratic mainstream. It launched the Russian and Georgian peoples' joint emergence in the arena of social progress and made the struggle for renewal a reality.

Georgia's union with Russia was a profoundly progressive event. Czarist Russia performed a progressive historic act. But it did so in a peculiar, counterrevolutionary manner.

There were two Russias at that time. Besides the czarist Russia there was a people's Russia, a revolutionary Russia which gave national-democratic Georgia the chance to share in the leading ideas of Russia and Western Europe and become a participant in the world revolutionary process.

As is well known, Marx and Engels deemed czarist Russia's domination to be a progressive, civilizing force in the life of the peoples of the East, and at the same time they were sympathetic to the Caucasian peoples' struggle against czarist despotism.

Drawing a profound parallel and comparison in "The Fall of Kars," Marx ascribed European-wide significance to Georgia's national-liberation movement in the struggle against Russian czarism, which at that time represented "a prison of peoples" and "an international gendarme."

Lenin remarked that Bismarck had, in a peculiar, Junker-style, counterrevolutionary manner, performed a progressive historical act. But "he was like the 'Marxist' who on those grounds attempted to justify socialist aid to Bismarck."

This postulate is of methodological significance. No patriot, no democrat could support czarism, which accomplished an objectively progressive act by reactionary means, through social and national oppression.

Czarism and capitalism created the material conditions for a new life. But they could not achieve progress "without subjecting both individuals and whole peoples to blood and filth, misery and suppression" (Marx). This is what brought about the rise and development of the national-liberation movement.

The character of the national question is defined by which class stands at the head of the nation, and when and for what reason it poses the national problem. After our union with Russia, the nobility's national movement arose. Its aim was to "free Georgia" and restore Georgian statehood, which some envisioned as a monarchy and others a republic. This movement was influenced by the Decembrists' movement and bore the traits of early enlightenment. But, just as in the case of enlightened aristocratic circles in certain European states who were expressing modern ideas during the same period, the enlightened Georgian aristocracy in 1832 were "in reality representatives of the interests of the reactionary class" (Marx).

In the 1860s, the history of the national question in Georgia entered a new era. The national question emerged in a new light. It found resolution in revolutionary national democratism.

Some scholars deny the revolutionary national democratism of Georgia's 1860 cohort on grounds that they did not incite rebellion or fire a shot but instead attempted to "educate the people."

As is well known, ideological revolution precedes and prepares for political revolution. According to Engels, the French educators deserved credit because "they enlightened people about the coming revolution" and that therefore they were themselves "extreme revolutionaries."

During the time of the 1860 cohort, the masses were not inclined toward action; at that time, words were deeds, and the pen did the sword's duty. In a time of literary influence, the weapon of criticism prepared for criticism by means of weapons. The Georgian enlighteners served the cause of national-democratic consciousness and envisioned the resolution of the national question as a replacement of czarist despotism by government of the people and a democratic Georgia in a democratic Russia.

It was a reasoned, idea-based revolutionary turning point in the history of Georgian social thinking. National emergence and the unfolding of national-democratic consciousness preceded and historically prepared for class emergence and the shaping of class consciousness in the Georgian proletariat.

Some scholars are of the opinion that as regards the national question Ilia Chavchavadze at first called for a maximum program of "complete independence" but then later "unwillingly" had to replace it with a "temporary" minimum program and be contented with a demand for autonomy, "getting government circles...to support him." As if Ilia took a separatist stance and started on the path of reformism.

But the general direction and basic tendencies of the work and efforts of Ilia, Akaki Tsereteli, Iakob Gogebashvili, and others demonstrate precisely the opposite. Ilia and the leading Georgian intellectuals of the time were firmly against the separatist movement. They were firmly in favor of a democratic alliance with Russia, by which they hoped to achieve their motherland's national rebirth and self-government. Akaki expressed these aspirations this way: "Long live renewed Russia and with her our own little Georgia!"

Revolutionary democrats Ilia Chavchavadze, Akaki Tsereteli, and their fellow thinkers "represented the Georgian branch of the all-Russian revolutionary democracy" (E. A. Shevardnadze).

According to Lenin, the creation of a national state represents the tendency and aspiration of every national movement. But the development of capitalism "by no means awakens every nation to an independent life." In a multinational state, by no means does every oppressed nation struggle for state independence. This is said of an oppressed nation which in the event of separation may be seized by a backward but aggressive neighboring state.

Ilia's well-known statement "we ought to rely on ourselves" was a demand for the right to self-determination, a demand for the right of the Georgian people to decide its fate in accordance with its own will and desires. Iakob Gogebashvili expressed this demand specifically as follows: "Georgia is an inseparable part of the Russian state, but a unique part, with its own language, culture, and self-government."

Georgia's 1860 cohort was active at a time when in Eastern Europe, the motherland, in Lenin's words, "had yet to have its full historical say," a time when the struggle for motherland "could be the defense of democracy, native language, and political freedom."

The workers' movement brought the social problem to the forefront, linking and subordinating the national question to it. It supported the general-national task

of the struggle for a politically free homeland, which was still on the agenda, and for which Georgia's 1860 cohort was fighting during both the democratic and the proletarian period of the liberation movement. It responded to and objectively served the proletarian-democratic movement led by social democracy.

The Georgian revolutionary enlighteners understood very well that their lot in history was "to plow and sow," but when they saw that "the ripened grain needed the sickle," they called for the reapers: "Do not hesitate to shed blood" (Akaki).

Marx stated that the revolution is well based, it goes about its work methodically. When preparations were complete and revolution was on the agenda, the Marxists could say to the Georgian enlighteners: "How well you have burrowed, old mole."

Georgia's social-democratic organization was internationalist from the start, and it grew and became stronger in the struggle against nationalism. Georgia's revolutionary social democracy advocated the Marxist national program, which called for all nations' full equality, the right of self-determination, and internationalist unity of the workers of all nations.

Lenin considered Caucasasia's social democracy to be a model of proletarian internationalism. He pointed out that the interests and the tasks of the workers' movement were well reflected in the local nationalities' thorough unity which had "prevailed so long and so successfully in the Caucasus."

Lenin elucidated the problem of reconciling nation with class. He rejected any concept of nation which appealed "to an artificial abstraction of the contradictions existing among the classes which make up that 'nation.'" A capitalist nation is fraught with class antagonism. This is why Lenin said that there are two nations in every nation. This by no means entails, however, that a nation is divided into classes and there is no more national entity. Lenin rejected the view which saw the abandonment of the class struggle as a defense of the nation's interests and which rejected the terms "population" and "people." The vulgarizers of Marxism did not understand that economic relations force classes having "different interests" to strive to "unite in a whole nation" on the grounds of "shared tasks," and that a nation's development is governed by the ascendant class, which reflects the demands of society's development.

Mesame Dasi, the Marxist and social-democratic organization, was the first to provide a Marxist interpretation of the national question in Georgia. Members of the Mesame Dasi clarified the place and role of class and nation in social life from the Marxist standpoint. In examining the question of internationalism and patriotism, they cited a remarkable (so Engels evaluated it) article by the French Marxist Jules Guedy, "Socialists and Homeland" (1893), in which he states: "We are by no means homeless. We are patriots. It is not the bourgeoisie, the rich, who are patriots--rather it is those who defend their homeland with their blood in times of trial and create their country's entire prosperity."

BRDZOLA clarified the Marxist position of the "revolutionary social-democrats' Mesame Dasi" with regard to the national question. It examined the problem of reconciling national and class interests and pointed out that history keeps giving rise to specific situations in which a nation's "common interests rank higher than particular class interests." But they "in no way" abolish the conflict of class interests. "Conflict of interests is the rule; reconciliation of such interests is a temporary exception."

The Georgian Marxists dispelled the misunderstanding that had arisen among the enlighteners with regard to their true tasks; they accepted the national-democratic heritage and traditions and declared publicly: "Political freedom and the rights of the sons and daughters of the homeland--such is the legacy of the 19th century, and it is we social democrats who must bring this legacy to fruition" (BRDZOLA).

Georgia's revolutionary Marxists kept their historic word. They turned it into a revolution. They convinced the working masses of the correctness of the Leninist national theory and program and, with the help of the Russian people, in February 1921 accomplished the socialist revolution which represented the continuation and culmination of the Great October Revolution in Georgia.

The objective and subjective foundations were laid for a positive, just resolution of the national question in our land. Georgia was transformed into a socialist nation. Under developed socialism, there is an ongoing, dual process of development and rapprochement of socialist nations in the brotherly family of the Land of the Soviets in the joint building of communism.

The magnificent dream of the Georgian enlighteners has become a reality; their wishes have come true. The Georgian nation's identity has revived, grown strong, and flowered both nationally and socially. This has been accomplished by Akaki's wonderful heroes, who emerged "from that nest known as the heart of the people" and were inspired by Akaki's Georgian words to "The Internationale" to seek "the age of goodness."

And so what value or justification can there be, in these days of our revered Akaki's jubilee, for a distorted newspaper incitement to expect a national hero?!

The scientific interpretation of the history and theory of the problem of nations and national relations has found practical realization in the Leninist policy of the GCP and the creative efforts of the working people.

The CPSU CC's draft "Basic Guidelines of Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-85 and the Period Through 1990" states that the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union became even stronger during the 10th Five-Year Plan and that in the coming decade we must foster the all-round development and rapprochement of the nations and nationalities of the USSR and strengthen the ideological-political unity of the Soviet people.

This task will be carried out. The guarantee of this is the struggle to create a healthy social-psychological climate and the party's and the people's creative patriotic and internationalist efforts.

6854

CSO: 1813

REGIONAL

'L'VOV SYSTEM' DISCUSSED AT OBLAST'S PARTY CONFERENCE

Kiev RADIANS'KA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 24 Dec 80 p 3

[Article by V. Martynov, Ye. Yampol's'kyy, 'RADIANS'KA UKRAYINA' special correspondents: "How the L'vov System Works"]

[Text] Tickets to L'vov are now reserved by many of those who believe in the power of leading experience. According to modest calculations, every year the oblast is visited on the average by up to a thousand delegations for this reason alone. Of course, representatives from various spheres of activity may satisfy their curiosity here. But there is one characteristic detail -- some hope to find an easier approach, to borrow from the L'vov area people "a miracle-algorithm" which when applied in their own area will yield success.

Involuntarily we recalled these peculiar pilgrims of the NTR [scientific-technical revolution] period in the conference hall. They should hear how difficult it was sometimes for the initiators to reproduce the first successful step. As to steps, V.I. Lenin wrote: "Incomparably more important than the first step will be the second and third steps, that is the transformation of the experience already considered by masses into an ideological baggage for new historical action."

As noted in the report by the candidate to the Politbureau CC CPUK membership, first secretary of party oblast committee V.F. Dobryk, the L'vov area industry has already fulfilled its plan for five years. Additional production is estimated at 300 million rubles. The five year task of selling milk, meat, eggs, wool and flax fiber to the state has been realized ahead of time.

The L'vov system... They started talking about it when this complex system of managing production quality in industry, the contemporary of the 10th Five-Year Plan, received all-union recognition.

Today the concept of "L'vov system" is synonymous with contemporary style, a complex approach in party leadership. Quite naturally, the question which takes people to the L'vov area -- "How does the system work?" -- was also at the center of attention at the oblast party conference. It was examined from broad political positions as management of all work quality. Pointing to the positive delegates indicated: losses are sustained in the agrarian sector, construction, transport and communal service where for various reasons the system effectiveness is lowered. It is the action instrument in oblast party organization working harmoniously

towards success only when the ranks are professionally and morally-politically well prepared and accurate organization and fulfillment controls, the key links in party work, are established.

Thus not everything planned has been realized. The projected work productivity increase has not been attained. The unequal contribution of cities and rayons is obvious. There are various circumstances and various appraisals. From the beginning of the conference there was a desire to indicate clearly where the reasons for difficulties are objective and where subjective. Where they are results of the elements and in which instances simply spontaneous results of poor work organization. The conference resorted to comparative analysis in tracing the connection between party leadership style and management result.

Oblast industry, for example, puts out only first and higher quality production; the specific weight of the latter has more than tripled reaching 27 percent. On the other hand, the specific weight of higher category production has decreased in a number of enterprises today. There are insufficient rates of production quality increase in enterprises in L'vov, Borislav, Peremyshlyanskiy and several other cities and rayons.

Or another example: the Busskiy, Kamensko-Bugskiy, Nesterovski and Stryyski Rayons are increasing the production of field and farm products. Things are worse in Mostisskiy, Sambirskiy and Nikolayevskiy Rayons.

However, it appears that both in successful and unsuccessful experiences the party committees held quite a few discussions and made a number of decisions. But the action was not in proportion to these efforts. The conclusion is: party work cannot be judged on the number of decisions and measures. In actual practice operative and competent party organ interference helps, as a rule, to prevent the change of subjective reasons into the ill-fated "objective" reasons. Delegates "Avtonavantazhuvach" association turner, workshop party organization secretary M.M. Strush, machine milking expert "Vynnykivs'kyy" Sovkhoz in Rostomytovskiy Rayon H.S. Doroshchuk, kolchoz imeni Zhdanov, Kamensko-Bugskiy Rayon team leader M.V. Savchyn and others, using their own experience, clarifying some common views on limits of the possible, stressed communists cannot passively await favorable circumstances.

Of course, a final summary carries weight. But not always. Party committee secretary of the "Kineskop" association V.I. Apryntseva stated with some bitterness:

"All of us party workers, including the executive committee, do not always "graft" experience and its "technology" successfully. Unfortunately, we are often satisfied with only naming the results."

Valentyna Ivanivna was supported by other delegates. They became even more exact in their talks. We also listen to these talks.

Delegate O.F. Sled', for example, examines in depth how improvements of internal party work and socialist competition affected the level of management. Next, I.H. Tabachyns'kyy in a qualified manner discloses the educational advantages of the brigade method of organization and work pay. If you didn't know it, you wouldn't

guess that the first speaker mentioned is the director of a bus factory, and the second a welder in a chisel factory.

Strokes, details and nuances... They are quite substantial and sometimes eloquent in party work. Conclusions may be drawn from them to some extent that the complex approach to education is becoming more clearly evident in style and methods.

Not all conference talks, of course, were equally worthwhile. In some tribute was paid to self-reporting. Now and again overly tearful fretting could be heard according to whatever might be ailing: "Using this opportunity we ask for a nudge, to promote...". But other reports predominated. The majority of delegates made active use of the opportunity to evaluate party oblast committee work more thoroughly, suggested ways for its improvement, revealed shortcomings in style and methods of management, and received criticism directed at them objectively.

Ways of improvement of various aspects of political mass education were discussed in talks by the party organization secretary of the Turkovskiy secondary school O.S. Vatakh, rector of the polytechnic institute M.O. Havrylyuk, administration chief of the oblast organization Union of Writers Ukr SSR R.M. Lubkiv's'kyi, first secretary of the Burskiy Rayon party committee P.D. Nazarchuk and other delegates. The unacceptability of the formal-quantitative approach to the evaluation of the level of atheistic education was particularly stressed.

New processes in economics and in the social sphere have called to life new forms and methods in organizational party work. In this respect, the oblast party committee oriented itself to a careful and critical selection. During the period reported soviets of production association party organization secretaries were formed as well as of large railroad junctions. The system of working with delegates is better organized. The leadership style of soviets and community organizations has improved. The avantgarde role of communists has increased. This was discussed by the first secretary of the L'vov city party committee V.V. Sekretaryuk, member of party organization bureau, sewing machine operator at the Stryi shoe factory O.H. Dzevaha, and head of the oblast professional soviet H.M. Pyzhyk.

Discussing delegates in the report, the L'vovskaya Oblast committee was guided first of all by the fact that it reported on its own activity.

"We should report who justified our trust and not shift onto others our own unfinished work," stressed the speaker.

Analyzing the state of affairs in a specific area, the conference pointed out where and how oblast committee secretaries and other committee members and section chiefs underfulfilled their tasks; advice was also given on how to improve leadership.

Member of the Politbureau CC CPUR, first deputy chairman of the Ukr SSR Soviet of Ministers H.I. Vashchenko spoke at the conference.

"Our party and people are meeting the 26th CPSU Congress in one line," said the speaker. At party conferences these days communists of the republic and of the whole country are summarizing the accomplished and analyzing the reserves. Reports

and elections revealed a monolithic unity in party ranks, an increased ideological maturity among communists, their steadfast support of the CC CPSU and the Politbureau headed by comrade L.I. Brezhnev.

In recent years the party was enriched with new experience in building communism. A large step was taken in the development of economics, in solving social problems. By their devoted work Soviet Ukraine workers in the USSR brotherly family of nations are increasing the power and glory of our fatherland. Quite a few notable things were accomplished in the prize winning L'vov area. In the report and delegates' comments which followed, the work of the oblast party committee was fundamentally and objectively evaluated for the reported period, and the situation in the oblast was deeply and thoroughly analyzed. During this period the oblast party committee worked productively making correct deductions from the criticism at the previous conference. That, of course, is good news. However, the CPSU teaches us not to be satisfied with the achieved, to work more and much better. Therefore a critical analysis of the achieved, evident at the conference, will help to reveal and utilize more fully new reserves, which, in their turn, will establish a firm foundation for successful work in the next five-year plan.

Having characterized the results achieved, the speaker drew attention to unsolved problems and ways of liquidating shortcomings, based primarily on the considerable experience of the oblast party organization in the struggle to increase effectiveness and quality.

It should be noted, first of all, stated H.I. Vashchenko, that some party committees are satisfied with general indicators, do not strive for unconditional plan fulfillment by each collective and provide little direction for workers to utilize all possibilities to increase the extent of production and production effectiveness. Although the oblast has a certain amount of work experience without lagging collectives, there are instances of delay also.

H.I. Vashchenko then analyzed the basic reasons which slow down the tempo of industrial development. Full production capability utilization has certainly not been achieved everywhere, there are substantial shortcomings in raising the technological level of a number of production forms, disturbing violations of work discipline as well as personnel fluctuations and a marked specific weight of manual labor. In some areas not enough new technology is being introduced. Shortcomings in capital construction seriously delay the growth in industrial production. Almost a third of the starting facilities and capabilities are not ready by the date anticipated. Enterprises for the production of consumer goods are being constructed slowly. Funds for housing are not utilized fully.

Considering agricultural problems, the speaker noted that the chief task today is to strive for an increase in output production, to overcome the great harvest unpredictability evident on some farms and rayons, putting more effort into increasing soil fertility. H.I. Vashchenko recalled that at the October (1980) CC CPSU Plenum the L'vovskaya Oblast was criticized for its low fund returns. Therefore, party, soviet and agricultural organs should carefully appraise the farm economic situation and help kolkhos and sovchos party organizations to raise their effectiveness.

The speaker stressed that the daily, all-around care for people's working and living conditions provide a guarantee for success in agriculture. Although attention is given to this within the oblast, there is still quite a bit to be done.

Giving a positive appraisal to efforts towards further organizational-political strengthening of primary party organizations, M.I. Vashchenko indicated that the present activity level of some does not meet the requirements of time. The importance of improving ideological activity was mentioned. In this case more active use should be made of the propaganda possibilities of the Soviet way of life, creating in each collective a healthy moral-political climate, with intolerance of poor organization and bad management.

At the end of his talk, M.I. Vashchenko commented on the atmosphere of high principles, industriousness, mutual expectation and good will during the conference. He wished the delegates, all communists and workers of the L'viv area success in realizing their plans to greet the 26th Party Congress worthily.

The conference also discussed the report "On the CC CPSU project for the 26th Party Congress 'Basic directions for USSR economic and social development for 1981-1985 and the period up to 1990'" given by the chairman of the oblast executive committee M.I. Kyrey. Delegates approved this document unanimously and submitted a series of suggestions.

9443

CSC: 1811

REGIONAL

INCREASED FREEDOMS FOR SOVIET MOSLEMS

Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 9 Feb 81 pp 150-152

[Text] Since Iran and Afghanistan the Soviet leadership has been wooing its Moslem minority.

Afghanistan, in the opinion of the Moscow magazine THE PEOPLES OF ASIA AND AFRICA on the anniversary of the Soviet incursion into the neighboring country, was "an example that the Soviet Union never abandons a friend." Then the paper informed its Moslem readers: "History proves without a doubt that friendship and cooperation between the Soviet state and Islamic countries makes it easier for the latter to pursue a policy of independence and also one of economic, social and cultural progress."

Moscow is making efforts to win over the Moslems. Moslems make up almost one-fifth of the population of the Soviet empire. Five of the 15 Soviet republics have a Moslem majority, and the Islamic population is increasing far more quickly than all other ethnic groups, above all more rapidly than the Russians, who now constitute only a slim majority in the empire. Already the USSR, with its more than 40 million Mohammedans, is the fifth largest Moslem country in the world.

But since 27 December 1979 the Russians have been waging war against a neighboring Moslem nation, the Afghans, on whom they have imposed a regime which has been unable to take root even after 1 year of Soviet occupation. Thirty-one of 40 Islamic countries again voted against Moscow in November of last year with a resolution on Afghanistan, 3 more than 1 year previously, immediately after the Soviet invasion.

Is the wind from Soviet Asia blowing against the rulers of the Soviet empire, from the region where most of the Soviet Mohammedans live, in proximity to the rebellious mullahs of Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan? Is "homo islamicus," as French author Helene Carriere d'Encausse calls him, taking shape against "homo sovieticus"?

He is not visible at any rate, or not yet visible. In comparison with their miserable cousins across the borders the Moslems in the south of the Soviet Union live too well; the control of the police state is also omnipresent. But events in Iran, where the ruler over a similarly well-organized police state was swept away just by the power of an ayatollah's word, have deeply disturbed the leaders

of the Soviet empire. The advanced defense of the empire in Afghanistan is not the least consequence of this anxiety. The native Moslems, decried for decades by party propaganda as medieval, whose mullahs were persecuted far more cruelly than orthodox priests, for example, whose mosques were destroyed more systematically than orthodox churches, are being wooed and indulged by official Soviet propaganda since Iran and Afghanistan.

Soviet propaganda is presenting their destiny in glowing colors: the Soviet Union as the true protector of the values of Islam, nothing is too expensive for it now, neither gold for the domes of restored mosques, nor currency for hand-picked pilgrims to Mecca.

Measured by the splendor of restored mosques, mausoleums and madrasahs (religious schools) in Central Asia, Islam in the USSR is experiencing a renaissance. Propaganda, which once held the teachings of Mohammed to be "an unscientific world view, alien to Marxism-Leninism and irreconcilable with the fundamental interests of the Soviet peoples," is now discovering deep similarities between the thoughts of Lenin and those of Mohammed. "Islam," PRAVDA suddenly discovered 60 years after the October revolution, "stands for the equality of all men, for greater social justice and an end to exploitation." In addition, the CPSU paper lauded, the Moslems were anti-imperialist by nature and therefore natural allies of the Soviet Union. The Soviet supreme mufti, Zia-ul-Din Babakhanov, tirelessly lauds to foreign fellow believers the fact that "we, the Moslems of the Soviet Union, enjoy full freedom in the exercise of our faith."

He is not always well received by those he addresses. An Islamic conference which met in September in Tashkent, was poorly attended--the most important Islamic nations had declined--, and even the remainder refused to make a joint closing statement with the red mufti, after he had blocked critical statements by closing the debate prematurely. "We do not trust Babachov," said one of the participants in the conference.

Sententious statements of the type, "We have bound our destiny for ever to that of Russia," like those made at the conclusion of a son-et-lumiere show in Samarkand, find little approbation in Moslem countries, which all gained their independence after World War II and, like the Ayatollah Khomeyni, see in the Soviet Empire the last colonial power in the world. Mufti Babakhanov can point with more success in a just published book, "Islam and Moslems in the Country of the Soviets," to the preservation of Moslem cultural monuments in the USSR.

In this area the Soviet Union--after decades of systematic destruction--is turning in a remarkable performance: almost all of the roughly 300 mosques, madrasahs and mausoleums which have survived--of more than 25,000 once existing in Soviet Asia--have been restored or are undergoing restoration in recent years.

The three madrasahs on Registan Square in the center of Samarkand--once one of the most magnificent cities of Islam--were completely rebuilt. The giant mosque of Bibi Khanum is being renovated, as far as is still possible. The Soviet Union donated 4 kg of gold leaf for the restoration of the mosaics in the mausoleum of Tamberlaine.

In the Uzbek SSR alone 52 historical Islamic buildings have been restored in the last 5 years. In the neighboring Tadzhik SSR, according to TASS, 3,000 historical and cultural monuments are under state protection. Venerable Chiva, along with Bukhara the Russians' newest acquisition in Central Asia, the sight of which, according to an Oriental Moslem legend, was worth "two bags full of gold," has been completely reconstructed in its medieval form and is now considered a tourist attraction in this part of the empire.

Of the 364 mosques and 109 madrasahs, which still existed in Bukhara in 1920, only 3 have remained as mosques functioning as a place of worship and 1 Koran school, but the center of the old city has been painstakingly renovated. It probably disturbs true followers of Allah that former places of prayer have been profaned by being converted into museums (some of them even for atheists), shops, workshops or even restaurants in which vodka is served.

Still, due to the preservation of the old sections of the city, the Moslem settlements are worlds apart in appearance from the prefabricated, standardized habitations which are almost typical for the entire Soviet empire. With their own quarters, the Moslems are also preserving their typical life-style. They intermarry with Russians or other outsiders far less than all the other nations in the USSR.

Moslem boys are all circumcised, as they always have been, Moslem girls do not marry nonbelievers, and sayings from the Koran in Arabic script still adorn Moslem graves today.

The Mohammedans, who according to the official Soviet view "have passed out of the Middle Ages in half a century," have recently been receiving official encouragement to recall this past that they have overcome. On the occasion of the 1,000th birthday of the famous Islamic philosopher, poet and doctor Ibn Sina (Avicenna), a 10-volume collection of all his works was published, a commemorative medallion was struck, memorials were erected and places and streets were named after him.

In some locations not only ancient Islamic culture is being restored, but--unheard of for the orthodox faithful--new places of worship are being built in which the faithful can pray to Allah. Ten new mosques, boasted TASS, had been constructed in the Uzbek SSR alone. For one of them, in Nasarbek near Tashkent, the city soviet donated the needed ground free.

This, the most populous Moslem republic in the Union, also received the highest secular award of the Soviet Union this year. It was awarded the Order of Lenin for its record cotton crop.

END

9581

CSO: 1826

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

26 March 81